# The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXI, No. 4 October, 1944

## CONTENTS

Martha de Noaillat and the Feast of Christ the King
*Joseph Husslein, S.J.* 241
A Ninth Century Canonist on Purgatory....*Henry G. J. Beck* 250
Peace in the Scriptures...............*Thomas Owen Martin* 257
The Catholic Lawyer.............*Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 274
A Soldier's Death, A Martyrdom?........*Albert Kleber, O.S.B.* 281
The Twofold Origin of the Church Militant
*Joseph Clifford Fenton* 291

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Morality of the Ouija Board........................ 305
The Catholic Teaching on Divorce........................ 306
Dangers to the Faith........................ 306
Priest as State Official in Marriages........................ 308
Monsignori in Processions........................ 310
The Double Ring Ceremony........................ 311

*Contents Continued on Next Page*

Published monthly by The Board of Trustees of The American Ecclesiastical Review, from Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md. Subscription price, U. S. currency or equivalent: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, January 10, 1944, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Maryland or to The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1944, by The American Ecclesiastical Review

*Contents continued from previous page*

BOOK REVIEWS

The Problem of Pain, *by C. S. Lewis* . . . . . . . . . . . 312
Latin Grammar, *by Cora Carroll Scanlon and Charles L. Scanlon*. 313
Carmelite and Poet, *by Robert Sencourt* . . . . . . . . . . . 314
Physics and Philosophy, *by Sir James Jeans* . . . . . . . . . . . 315
Humanity: What? Whence? Whither? *by W. E. Orchard* . . . . . . 316
A Key to Happiness, *by Marguerite Duportal* . . . . . . . . . . . 317
Subdeaconship, *by Aloysius Biskupek, S.V.D.* . . . . . . . . . . . 318
Deaconship, *by Aloysius Biskupek, S.V.D.* . . . . . . . . . . . 318
BOOK NOTES . . . . . . . . . . . 320

**For the Sacristy and the Sanctuary**

***Manual of***

**Forty Hours' Adoration**

THIS Manual Contains LITANIAE ET PRECES: the Approved Music for "Te Deum" and "Tantum Ergo," and everything requisite for the Devotion—Ceremonies, Rubrics and Prayers.

Order copies now, so that they will be on hand when needed, as they are sure to be.

**Twenty-five cents per copy.**
**Five copies, one dollar**

**The American Ecclesiastical Review**
**Catholic University of America**
**Washington 17, D. C.**

***When the Bishop comes, it is well to have at hand the***

**Manual of**

**Episcopal Visitation and Sacrament of Confirmation**

Full and detailed information, both for the ceremony of Confirmation and for the Bishop's official visit. All the canonical prescriptions minutely explained. Indispensable for the occasion.

**Twenty-five cents per copy**
**Five copies, one dollar**

**The American Ecclesiastical Revie**
**Catholic University of America**
**Washington 17, D. C.**

# MARTHA DE NOAILLAT AND THE FEAST OF CHRIST THE KING

Two especially memorable events, of enduring importance to mankind, have marked the last half century. One was the consecration of the entire human race to the Sacred Heart of Jesus at the triumphant close of the Holy Year of 1900. The other was the no less significant establishment, on December 11, 1925, of the Feast of Christ the King.

From the days of her earliest history, when the Apostles went forth upon their mission to teach and to baptize all nations, the Church has been "Catholic," universal, with Christ her Ruler as the rightful King of all mankind. The two great acts of modern times imply no doctrine that is new, but emphasize in an especially effective way the great truth of Christ's Kingship as embracing under His dominion pagans, Jews and Christians; governments and the peoples governed; democracies, dictatorships and royalties.

"Nor is there any difference in this matter," wrote Pope Pius XI in his Encyclical on the Kingship of Christ, "between the individual, and the family and the state, for all men, whether collectively or individually, are under the dominion of Christ."

Moreover, so closely connected are the two ideas of the consecration of all men to the Sacred Heart of our Saviour and the establishment of the Feast of Christ the King, as now in perpetuity celebrated every year, that the two naturally blend together. So we find it to be in the mind of Pius XII when in his *Summi Pontificatus* he wrote: "As we review from the standpoint of eternity the past forty years in their exterior events and interior developments, balancing achievements against deficiencies, We see ever more clearly the sacred significance of the consecration of mankind to Christ the King."

It is on the Feast of Christ's Kingship, as we know, that now the annual solemn renewal of the dedication of all humanity to the Sacred Heart takes place, thus beautifully combining the Power of Christ with the Love of Christ.

Long ago, as we are here made aware, the Church had anticipated that surge of Internationalism which was to sweep over the earth with the second world war, and which is destined still further to engage our thoughts in the days when the carnage has ended. The bombs that fell on Pearl Harbor gave birth, in the glare of their fiery havoc, to a new international era that is with us—and is with us to stay.

Yet it had been two decades of years before this event that the Church, by her declaration of the universal Kingship of Christ, stood prepared for the developments to follow on an earth now shrunk in space, with distances annihilated and peoples pressing beyond their borders.

Yes! there was room for all, there was food for all, there was wood in the forests and ore in the hills. But the one thing still needed, the thing most essential for any true fraternal co-operation, was a sound recognition of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God, and with it a hearty acceptance of the rightful royalty of Christ, their Sovereign Lord of all, Immortal King of Ages. Without that, there could be no solution to the social question, nor yet of the vast international issues that now were rising like a mist from the seven seas and gathering like a cloud over all the five great continents.

It was this truth, the need of a realization and practical acceptance by men of the universal Kingship of Christ, less tangibly apparent then than now, which Martha de Noaillat had keenly sensed. Others, no doubt, were more or less aware of it, but *she was moved by it to action.*

Once clear in her own conviction of the immediate measure to be carried into effect, nothing thenceforth could halt her, nothing could disturb her. Her mind was clear as crystal, her will firm as steel, but above everything else her heart had all a true woman's love—love of God that was able to carry her to any length of sacrifice.

In a word, she stands out to me as the most remarkable of all modern women whose mission lay outside the convent wall. At all events she can·not fail to be an inspiration to everyone.

A precocious child, an eager student, a wide reader of all that could be for her best improvement, she was early inflamed with zeal and filled with a consuming spirit of sacrifice. At the same time her social virtues were developed to an unusual degree by constant works of practical charity. It was this that made of her, even as a very young girl, a most efficient social worker among the poor and the distressed of every kind, concerned always with equal solicitude for the good of their souls as of their bodies. This characteristic she was to retain and to develop still more throughout her life.

Thus, from childhood up, she was an instrument left in the hands of God to be freely fashioned and as freely used by Him for all His purposes, even the highest and most arduous. On her part, she would never refuse. Yet this does not belie the fact that she was human, womanly—and finely so.

A providential woman is Martha. Viewed in retrospect, her life seems like some great classic drama, leading steadily and majestically, scene by scene, act by act, to a single supreme climax. The very circumstances under which the original French edition of her life came to me might appear indeed hardly less than providential.

One day, as it happened, a well known home-missionary priest of the West called on me to inquire whether some suitable French or Spanish book could be found by me for translation into English by a capable woman writer, handicapped by a paralysis from infancy. Under war conditions this was no easy proposition. But what was my surprise when within less perhaps than twenty-four hours, an earnest petition from the East arrived urging the translation and publication of a most important French work that had already been rendered into various languages during the brief period since its appearance. All rights were assured. Would I care to see it?

The nature of my reply was obvious and the book arrived post-haste. I raced through its pages in almost a single session. The title was *Marthe de Noaillat, 1865–1926*. To my astonishment I found that this most modern apostle, to whom we owe above all others the significant institution of the Feast of Christ the King, had folded to her breast, as her dearest treasure, a little blind *paralyzed* girl. And it was this attachment, she said, that gave her "a mother's heart."

Was, then, the hand of Martha visible in this choice of a translator for her life? We wonder!

It was not until close to the beginning of the year 1943 that the first edition of the English translation appeared under its appropriate title, *The King's Advocate*.[1] Many of my readers may well have scanned it by this time, and it is not my purpose here to write a review, much less a digest of this book, but rather to convey something of the providential nature of the life of this extraordinary woman, who so vividly realized the supreme duty of impressing on our age, and on the ages still to come, the obligation of acknowledging the rights of God before we can reasonably hope for a recognition of the rights of men.

But for this great missionary effort a long preparation was demanded and wonderful indeed were the ways of God with Martha.

---

[1] *The King's Advocate*, translated from Simone de Noaillat-Ponvert's *Marthe de Noaillat, 1865–1926*, by Mary Golden Donnelly. (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company.)

With her whole nature in revolt against entering a cloister, Martha nevertheless was convinced that she had a call to the religious life. Three times, therefore, in the course of seven years, she made the heroic effort, and each time found herself before long at death's door. Returned to her home to recover, she tried and tried again, until at last she was carried out on a litter, to die—as everyone believed.

But that was not God's plan. She now had taken the three religious vows of Poverty, Chastity and Obedience. From these she would never ask to be relieved but would practise them faithfully to death—even when circumstances demanded her marriage to the man with whose co-operation only could she achieve the supreme purpose of her life. That, as we know, would be to bring about, after long years of heroic toil, of keen disappointments and ecstatic triumphs, the ultimate establishment of the annual and most solemn celebration of the Feast of Christ the King throughout all the earth.

She had now finished two stages of her preparation: the home and convent training. The third development awaited her.

The anti-religious laws of France were now in effect. The carrying on of educational work by the Sisters had been made an impossibility. "Many superiors," the translator notes, "secularized members of their communities." They permitted them to remove their religious habits and observe their vows in the world. With her sound educational background, Martha leaped into the breach and took over the direction of a prominent School staffed by such "secularized" religious, to whose number, of course, she did not belong.

With the highest success achieved in her educational leadership she was next induced to enter into a far wider field. In each case it was Providence that prepared for her next step. In fact no less a person than Cardinal Richard himself had pleaded with her the cause of "persecuted free education." It was now an entirely new and unforeseen influence that drew her out of these congenial surroundings to work for an even larger cause.

There was question next of striking directly at the root of the evil in republican France by preventing the election of unworthy public representatives. Women did not have the vote, but they could organize to bring their influence into play on the men. For this cause able public speakers and skillful organizers were required. Such was the laudable work of the Patriotic League of French Women to which she now gave her service.

It all began with the advent on her horizon of Simone de Noaillat and her brother George de Noaillat, who persuaded her not to devote her abilities and intellectual power to one single school, when Catholic France itself sorely needed her. The argument was convincing and she cast in her lot with them.

A fearless and eloquent speaker, whether on the soapbox or in the large crowded hall, Martha, with her profound faith and brilliant intellectual power, quickly rose to leadership and was everywhere in demand. Tirelessly travelling from place to place wherever help was needed, she spared herself no labors, while her frail frame seemed often near collapse but continued to stand up under the fierce strain.

And here, perhaps, a slight digression may be permitted. The incredibly slight quantity of food on which she subsisted would seem utterly inadequate for any human creature. In addition she performed daily penances and her rest at night was always on a blanket spread out upon the floor. As director of the high-class Bossuet School her chosen habitat had been "a little dormer room about ten feet square, and through the center of which rose a chimney stack." To this must be added the daily recitation of her breviary with celestial relish, her works of charity, and the long periods spent in the presence of her King in the Blessed Sacrament.

And yet, withal, she was the most cheerful creature upon earth, since we must here talk in superlatives, desiring a quarter of an hour every day for a good hearty laugh before withdrawing for the night. Such was Martha.

But really to understand her we must read of her innumerable undertakings of social work and zeal, as recounted in the *Life*. Coming to a large city, in the periods when unengaged by other duties, she might disappear for days, spending herself entirely in the most abandoned labor quarters, and no one knew or ever learned on her return of her work that she had done for Christ the King. Called to Africa to nurse a sick soldier relative, she quickly had built up, throughout the entire section, a string of native Catechism Instruction Classes, functioning to the endless delight of the missionary priests. Taking a street car somewhere for a quarter of an hour's ride, she pleasantly stepped up to the conductor and asked him about the state of his soul. He was fully prepared for confession by the time she arrived at her destination—and be sure there were no wrecks on the road! She had an eye open always for the practical side of things.

That is but a taste of the things she did through all her life, the little asides that would be great events in the lives of other people.

But through George and Simone de Noaillat Martha now came in touch with a still larger field of apostolate, circumscribed by no limits except those of the inhabited globe of the earth. It was her final apostolate, the apostolate of the Universal Kingship of Christ, to be spread by the establishment of an annual Feast of Christ the King, the great climax of her life.

Significantly enough, we here come in contact once more with devotion to the Sacred Heart. For it was at *Paray-le-Monial*, of all places on earth, that the Revelations of the Divine Heart had been made to St. Margaret Mary, and here too it was that the idea of the Kingship of Christ was to receive its triumphal promotion in modern days.

Here stood the temple-like building of the Hieron, constructed with the one idea that "Christ must reign." It was an outpost, as we might call it, for the spread of devotion to the Divine King, and ultimately came entirely under the direction of George de Noaillat. From this as a center to which they might always return, Martha, Simone and George now carried on their vigorous apostolate for France and the world.

But the day came when the heart-call of Simone to build her own home had to be respected, and the first child she bore to the worthy man who had won her love was a babe totally blind and paralyzed, laid for her in the arms of Martha. It was this child that was to give to her "a mother's heart," and it was this child of which in its later years she said that in Heaven we should know all it had contributed to bring about the triumphant establishment of the Feast of Christ the King.

Here, then, was the next objective in Martha's career: to carry out through long years the inexpressible labors which this task would impose. It was a work for which she needed the close co-operation of George de Noaillat, and now that they were left alone together to assume this task there was but one thing for them to do—and that was to marry. This they did, on the understanding, of course, that Martha would observe as before her three sacred vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. It was a union in Christ and for Christ.

In the hard work which was now to be accomplished we must not belittle the part played by George de Noaillat. But highly capable as M. de Noaillat was, he would be the first to insist that the inspiration, the genius, the invincible courage needed were Martha's above all.

Her logic, as we have seen, was simple. For the rights of men to be respected, the rights of God must first be recognized. Or, as Pius XI expressed it: "If we are to have the peace of Christ, we must begin by acknowledging in a practical way the reign of Christ."

But obviously, the proclamation only of the great truth of Christ's Kingship over all mankind would not suffice. It must be brought home, not once or twice, but with an overwhelming reiteration such as can be secured only through the solemn repetition of a Feast of Christ the King, celebrated each recurring year with all becoming pomp and circumstance, and with all the eloquence of the spoken word.

But to bring this petition to the favorable notice of Rome a document was necessary to present the case with all the utmost pertinence of argument. And here precisely we come to what must beaccepted as one of the most remarkable facts in her career.

The perfectly worded and extensive document submitted to the Pope had been written by her without a single change or erasure. Her pen sped over the pages, merely pausing for a moment here and there as she selected the proper word. But not a flaw was ever found in it. Hardly, we dare to say, would the greatest scholar of the day have dared to duplicate this feat which seemed so natural to Martha!

Let us realize, moreover, that two successive Pontiffs had to be won over by her: Benedict XV and Pius XI.

Though the cause which Martha and her husband championed was at once fully favored by the Holy See, yet they were not allowed to make mention of this fact in securing signatures of cardinals, bishops and members of religious orders throughout the world.

Slow, hard work it was, going from door to door, and finally reaching out to the ends of the earth for the necessary *bene placet*. One of their greatest obstacles was the rejection, some twenty years previously, of a similar petition. No wonder that they found themselves blamed by persons of importance for lack of conformity to the Holy See and urged to desist from their ill-conceived efforts.

But the will of the Pope was iron. The petition must come entirely from without and not as favored by him.

The first presentation of Martha's petition was made to Pope Benedict XV, at the time of the celebration of the canonization of Margaret Mary, May 13, 1920, and it was ultimately signed by 779 cardinals, bishops and generals of religious orders.

But before this list of signatures was completed an entirely new task was imposed. Yes, argued Pope Pius XI who now reigned, we are receiving the enthusiastic approval of the teaching Church, but what of the masses? That was the thought in the Pontiff's mind. "The masses!" Their voice too had to be heard and they must be duly informed and prepared. "If the bishops, if the press," said the Pontiff, "if the leaders of society and institutions welcome the idea, then we shall be able to attain that widespread preparation of the masses which is necessary."

It was a crushing burden to place anew on the exhausted shoulders of the two faithful workers. Martha was the first to summon up courage.

"The time has not yet come; we must continue to work. It is not surprising that so great a thing costs many efforts."

During this second period it was that I myself was requested, as connected with *America*, to write an editorial in which with all my best ability I sought to make plain the need for the establishment of a Feast of Christ the King. More than that. Before the Feast was actually celebrated I had gotten out the first popular pamphlet on the subject, which the priests throughout the country could use to aid them in preparing their triduum of instructions previous to the first celebration of the Feast of Christ the King.[2] The pamphlet was kept in circulation all these years and is one of the million on millions of things for which the initiative is due to the dauntless spirit of Martha de Noaillat.

Similar things were happening over all the earth, and soon the Vatican was flooded with lists of names from the four quarters of the compass, petitioning earnestly the institution of the great Feast of Christ the King.

Rome had no further reason to delay. For seven hours Martha knelt in the Vatican Basilica, close to the Pope, where the first Mass of the Feast of Christ the King was being sung by the Pontiff. Martha herself had secured a Benedictine for the composition of the music. And when, at last, with her husband, she left the sacred edifice, the newsboys were on all sides waving in the air their papers containing the Encyclical on Christ the King, just written by Pope Pius XI in happy compliance with the urgings of Martha.

Almost six years of strenuous efforts, disappointments, joys and struggles had now passed, with the whole world for her apostolate, since the day when Martha's petitions for the institution of this great, providential Feast of Christ the King, had been placed in the hands of Benedict XV.

She had done her work—the work for which apparently she had been brought into the world; for which she had been trained and ripened and prepared; and which at last she had now accomplished, under the guidance of Divine Providence.

---

[2] *Christ the King* (New York: The America Press.)

What remained for her now, we may ask, except to hear the voice of her King, ineffably sweet above all the music of the stars: "Well done, good and faithful servant"? Her task had been completed. God's plan for her own era had faithfully been carried out. Who knows through what long centuries that Feast of Christ the King will still continue to inspire souls and stir them into action?

Returning without further delay to Paray-le-Monial, Martha arrived immediately before the First Friday of the new year, 1926. There, in the selfsame chapel in which Christ had appeared to Saint Margaret Mary, she made her Confession, and on the following day received Communion before the Altar of the Apparition.

Back to the Hieron then she turned, where she meant to partake of her modest breakfast with an aged friend. They sat face to face, but as she lifted up her cup to sip of it she felt herself overpowered by a gaseous exhalation, due to a stove in a room beneath. Her hand set down the cup and her body slipped to the floor—asphyxiated!

It was God's way. Whatever the scientific explanation, it was God's Providence that at precisely this very moment, with her great task completed and her soul beautifully prepared in the Chapel of the Apparition, such an accident should occur where for twenty-five years no suspicion of any danger from the source in question had ever been entertained. "Her death," wrote the Superior General of the Augustinian Fathers of the Assumption, "is like the ransom paid for an immense grace won for the Church."

But what of the little blind paralyzed girl Josette? Would Martha leave her behind? "For years I have been asking God to take up into His Heaven again our little Marie-Josèphe," Martha had said. "Shall I have to die to obtain her deliverance?"

Hardly had Martha breathed her last when, most unexpectedly, just three days later, Josette too passed away. "Martha has come to get her," was the mother's ejaculation. Josette had her part to play which the world could little understand, and her task was accomplished.

At Paray-le-Monial, over the grave of Martha, is a modest tombstone with a raised cross graven upon it, and at the center of the cross is the Sacred Heart of Christ her King.

"Christ conquers!" "Christ reigns!" "Christ rules!"

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.

*St. Louis University,*
*St. Louis, Mo.*

# A NINTH CENTURY CANONIST ON PURGATORY

Two of the most authoritative studies I have seen[1] appear unable to trace the use of the term *Purgatory* in its form as a ***noun*** to a date earlier than the *Sermo* LXXXV[2] of Hildebert of Le Mans (1055–1134). It is known, of course, that the word was used much before that time as an *adjective*. St. Augustine, indeed, as far back as the fifth century, had employed the phrase "purgatorius ignis,"[3] and after him, Sts. Caesarius of Arles[4] and Gregory the Great;[5] while St. Gregory had written also of "flammis purgatoriis."[6]

Recently I have come upon an interesting usage, in a text dating between the years 853/856, wherein the two phrases are combined into "flammis ignis purgatorii." It may be, of course, that here "purgatorii" is still an adjective modifying "ignis," but I do not think that we can dismiss the possibility that it has already begun to be used as a noun. Neither the context nor the actual form of the word itself make untenable the view that "purgatorii" is here an appositional genitive. I should like to suggest, therefore, that we may be able to push back the substantive use of *Purgatory* well beyond the time of Hildebert into the middle ninth century.

The text wherein this phrase occurs has not, I think, been noticed heretofore. It was not available, indeed, to either Bellarmine or Suarez, the classic authors on Purgatory, for its *editio princeps* dates only from Sirmond in 1645. Since that date, it has been overlooked by the masterly treatises of Collet and Allatius.[7] More recently, the largest study in English,[8] along with the standard German works[9] and the latest French surveys[10] have failed to note it, though it was re-edited by Migne in 1852.

---

[1] A. Michel in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, XIII (1936), 1228 and M. Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium* (Paris, 1931), IV, 85 n.

[2] *PL*, CLXXI, 741b.

[3] *PL*, XL, 265. St. Augustine evidences some hesitancy as to the nature of this purifying fire. For an adequate summary of his views cf. E. Portalié, *DTC*, I (1903), 2447–2449.

[4] *PL*, XXXIX, 1947; cf. also *PL*, LXVII, 1041.

[5] *PL*, LXXVII, 396.

[6] *PL*, LXXIX, 568.

[7] Both reprinted in Migne, *Theologiae Cursus Completus*, XVIII, 267–364, 364–460.

[8] M. Canty, *Purgatory, Dogmatic and Scholastic* (Dublin, 1886).

[9] Leo Redner. *Das Fegfeuer: eine historisch-dogmatische Abhandlung* (Regensburg, 1856); Joseph Bautz, *Das Fegfeuer* (Mainz, 1883); Franz Schmid, *Das Fegfeuer nach katholischer Lehre* (Brixen, 1904); Bernhard Bartmann, *Das Fegfeuer* (Paderborn, 1929; Eng. tr., London, 1936).

One can hardly be puzzled thereat for the section is but an *obiter dictum* in a work that makes no other reference to Purgatory. Moreover, it is the phrase of a canonist, Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims (c. 806–882), who, although he has been called by Beckmann "most notable amongst prelates in the Kingdom of the Franks,"[11] has, nevertheless, fared very badly at the hands of biographers. The most recent life we have of him in English dates from 1849.[12] Even the classic German study by Schrörs is already sixty years old.[13]

It may be well to reproduce the whole text for I have not found anything quite like it prior to the late Middle Ages that synthesizes so nicely Catholic teaching upon Purgatory. Apparently, it appealed to Hincmar himself; some thirteen to sixteen years after he had written it, he copied it again—with but two variants—in his *De Cavendis Vitiis.*[14] The original text in the *Explanatio in Ferculum Salomonis*—dated by Schrörs between 853/856,[15] reads thus:

> Nonnulli propter bona quidem opera ad electorum quidem sortem praeordinati, sed propter mala aliqua, quibus polluti de corpore exierunt, post mortem severe castigati, excipiuntur flammis ignis purgatorii, et vel usque ad diem iudicii longa huius examinatione a vitiorum sorde mundantur, vel certe prius amicorum fidelium precibus, eleemosinis, ieiuniis, fletibus et hostiae salutaris oblationibus absoluti poenis, et ipsi ad beatorum perveniunt requiem.[16]

There is an extraordinary fullness to that single paragraph. One can find in it at least the following ten points of doctrine clearly expressed: (1) Purgatory exists; (2) those admitted thereto are of the elect and are intended ultimately for heaven, (3) yet because there is some stain that clings to them even in death, (4) subsequent to their passage from this life they are subjected to severe punishment[17] by fire, (5) by means of which castigation they are cleansed from the taint of their sins. (6) They may, indeed, have to undergo this purification until the day of Final Judgment, (7) though they can be released before that time.[18] (8) Much can be done toward getting them free of their torments by the good works of the faithful still on earth (9) and by the Sacrifice of the Mass. (10) Thus, in one fashion or the other, they are brought, at length, to the unending happiness of the blessed.

---

[10] P. Bernard, art. "Purgatoire" in *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique,* IV (1928), 496–528; A. Michel, art. "Purgatoire" in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique,* XIII (1936), 1163–1326.

[11] In *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche,* V (1933), 64.

[12] James C. Prichard, *The Life and Times of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims* (Littlemore, 1849).

[13] Heinrich Schrörs, *Hinkmar Erzbischof von Reims: Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Freiburg-i-br., 1884).

[14] *PL,* CXXV, 911d–912a; probably written in 869, cf. Schrörs, p. 536 (Register, n. 251).

[15] Schrörs, p. 524 (Register, n. 88).

[16] *PL,* CXXV, 820d–821a corrected according to the *editio princeps* in J. Sirmond, *Hincmari Archiepiscopi Remensis Opera* (Paris, 1645), I, 759.

As far as I know, not any one public statement of the Church on Purgatory—not even the Profession of Faith sanctioned by the Second Council of Lyons and repromulgated at the synod of Ferrara-Florence—is quite as full as the text of Hincmar. All his points, indeed, with the possible exception of n. 6, can be found in documents of subsequent popes and councils, but not all of them in one single declaration.

For the sake of showing the perfect concordance of Hincmar's ten points with later Catholic teaching—defined or otherwise—there may be some value in providing the following table of references selected from ecclesiastical documents contained in Denzinger's *Enchiridion*:

Point n. 1: "purgatorium esse" is defined by the 25th session of the Council of Trent.[19]

Point n. 2: Both the synods of II Lyons[20] and Ferrara-Florence[21] refer to the souls in Purgatory as "vere poenitentes" who have died "in [Dei] caritate;" that is confirmed by Pope Leo X's condemnation of Luther's error which held that not all in Purgatory are assured of salvation.[22]

---

[17] At *PL*, CXXV, 1191a, Hincmar adds that the torments suffered vary from individual to individual, being apportioned "pro qualitate operum"; for the same view cf. A. Lépicier, *Tractatus de Novissimis* (Paris, 1921), p. 278; and Schmid, *Das Fegfeuer*, p. 202, who gives references from Bellarmine and Albertus a Bulsano.

[18] If Hincmar's text at this point be taken literally, he would seem to have held an opinion similar to that in the vision of Drithelm recorded by Bede, *Eccl. History of the English Nation*, V, 12 (ed. Dent, 1903, pp. 326f.), namely, that only through the assistance of the faithful on earth can the departed be freed from Purgatory before the day of Final Judgment. Bautz, (pp. 181 f.), rejects this view as one which "geht ohne Zweifel viel zu weit," as does Suarez, *De Purg.*, d. 46, s. 4, n. 5 (ed. Vivès, XXII, 921), for whom such a belief is "incredibile."

[19] *DB*, 983.

[20] *DB*, 464.

[21] *DB*, 693.

[22] *DB*, 778. On the reasons for this security of salvation cf. Bautz, pp. 125–29; and Canty, pp. 130–43.

Point n. 3: The 30th of Trent's canons on justification[23] defines that a "reatus poenae temporalis" may still remain for solution in Purgatory even after the guilt of sin has been remitted; II Lyons and Ferrara-Florence, cited just above, speak of those who die "antequam dignis poenitentiae fructibus de commissis satisfecerint et omissis" as having a debt still to be paid beyond the grave.

Point n. 4: Ferrara-Florence goes no further in its description of the castigation after death than to declare that it is accomplished "poenis purgatoriis;"[24] individual popes have been more definite as to the nature of the punishment, thus Innocent IV mentions "transitorio igne,"[25] Sixtus IV "purgatorio igni"[26] and Clement VI "quod igne crucientur ad tempus."[27]

---

[23] *DB*, 840.

[24] *DB*, 693. The absence of further specification in this decree is deliberate; by the middle of July, 1438, the Latin theologians at Ferrara had given up their effort to secure a declaration on the reality of the fire in Purgatory. (Cf. A. D'Alès, "La Question du Purgatoire au concile de Florence en 1438" in *Gregorianum*, III [1922], pp. 47 ff.) Yet but three weeks earlier, on June 27, the Latins at the council had recorded their personal belief in that fire and had proclaimed their conviction that such was the constant teaching of the Roman Church. (Cf. the document published by G. Hofmann: "Zweites Gutachten der Lateiner über das Fegfeuer [Concilium Florentinum, II]" in *Orientalia Christiana*, XVII, 2 [March, 1930], pp. 217 f.)

[25] *DB*, 456.

[26] *DB*, 723a.

[27] *DB*, 570s. It will be noted that these papal statements are not definitions. Catholic teaching on the reality of the fire in Purgatory has been investigated especially by Franz Schmid, *Das Fegfeuer nach katholischer Lehre* (Brixen, 1904) and by A. Michel, art. "Feu du Purgatoire" in *DTC*, V (1913), 2246–2261. Both are aware, of course, that the matter is not an article of Faith. Schmid paraphrases Suarez (though he, personally, would tend to express himself more strongly,—cf. p. 212) in holding that the existence of real fire in Purgatory is so highly probable as to pass for certain. Nevertheless, he refrains from assigning anything more than a private theological qualification to such teaching (Cf. pp. 210 f., 214). He himself makes much of the fact that the great mass of Catholics profess unhesitatingly this belief (p. 5 ff.); he gives great weight to the consensus of theologians on the point and sees implicated therein the magisterium of the Church (pp. 37, 40); he is of the opinion that the testimonies of the Fathers to such fire add up almost to moral certitude (p. 124). Michel, for his part, examines the views of both Greeks and Latins and thereby justifies his calling belief in the reality of the fire "sententia probabilissima." It may be possible to go somewhat farther. L. Lercher, *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae* (2nd ed., Innsbruck, 1935), IV, n. 609 uses the censure "doctrina probabilissima et unice tuta." The qualifications assigned by other theologians are quoted in Schmid, pp. 34 ff. and, briefly, in B. Beraza, *Tractatus de Deo Elevante, de Peccato Originali, de Novissimis* (Bilbao, 1924), n. 1228.

Point n. 5: Ferrara-Florence, repeating II Lyons, defines that through their sufferings "animas . . . post mortem purgari."[28]

Point n. 6: While ecclesiastical documents are clear as to the temporary nature of Purgatory, they do not seem to have felt the need of specifying the point that will see its ending. Theologians, however, hold as certain that its torments will be done by the day of Final Judgment.[29]

Point n. 7: Clement VI instructed the Armenians that souls may be released from their period of purgation "etiam citra diem judicii."[30]

Points nn. 8, 9: The 25th session of Trent defined: "animas . . . detentas fidelium suffragiis, potissimum vero acceptabili altaris sacrificio iuvari."[31] That is similarly the teaching of II Lyons and Ferrara-Florence, cited above.

Point n. 10: Benedict XII defined that those souls who have need of Purgatory "mox post mortem suam et purgationem praefatam . . . fuerunt, sunt et erunt in coelo, coelorum regno et paradiso coelesti cum Christo, sanctorum Angelorum consortio aggregatae."[32]

The foregoing analysis brings out, I think, the sound nature of the text in Hincmar of Rheims. It makes one aware of the knack he had of putting together into one single statement so many points of doctrine.

There are one or two other things in Hincmar which throw light upon his *obiter dictum.* Thus, he has a statement whereby he justifies prayers and Masses for the slain in battle on the warrant of II Mach. 12: 43.[33] The text is still, for modern theologians, the *locus classicus* on Purgatory in the Scriptures.[34]

---

[28] *DB*, 693. This concept of the expiatory nature of the pains endured in Purgatory is one of the three elements in the Catholic dogma on that state. The other two are, of course, (1) the existence of a temporary stage of torment which is intermediate between heaven and hell; (2) the possibility of aid to the suffering souls on the part of the faithful still on earth. (Cf. P. Bernard in *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique*, IV (1928), 496 f.) The statement in B. Jungmann, *Tractatus de Novissimis* (2nd ed., Regensburg, 1874), p. 82, that Catholic dogma contains only two truths regarding Purgatory creates but an apparent difficulty. Jungmann's first truth combines the concepts of an intermediate state and of expiation (cf. p. 85).

[29] Chr. Pesch, *Praelectiones Dogmaticae* (5th ed., Freiburg-i-br., 1923), IX, n. 606; H. Lennerz, *De Novissimis* (3rd ed., Rome, 1934), n. 263.

[30] *DB*, 570s. The thesis: "Non purgari singulas animas usque ad judicii diem" is maintained by Suarez, *De Purgatorio*, d. 46, s. 4, n. 5 (ed. Vivès, XXII, 921). The same view has gotten into popular ascetical tracts; cf. W. H. Anderdon, *Purgatory Surveyed* (London, 1874), pp. 38–41.

[31] *DB*, 983. The major questions connected with these suffrages are discussed at length by Bautz, pp. 194–248, and by Canty, pp. 168–210; more briefly by Michel, *DTC*, XIII (1936), 1301–1310.

[32] *DB*, 530.

In another place, Hincmar's faith in the efficacy of prayers and the Holy Sacrifice for the suffering souls stands manifest. Toward the end of 877, the Archbishop of Rheims sent off a circular to his brother-ecclesiastics wherein he described a happening that occurred as a peasant lay dying in his diocese. He entitled it *De Visione Bernoldi.* For the fact of the vision I should not want to vouch. That Hincmar accepted it is all that matters for our purpose. Amongst the things Bernold said he saw—and which Hincmar thought worth publishing—is this particular:

> I was led from this into the other world[35] . . . there I came into a murky place . . . where I saw lying in a filth formed by the outpourings of his own sores, our King Charles [the Emperor Charles the Bald, d. Oct.] 877, so eaten by worms that there was no flesh left on him but only bones and sinews. He called me by name. "Why do you not help me?" he cried. "Sire, how can I help you?" I asked . . . . "Go to Bishop Hincmar," he said, "tell him that for my sins I am suffering all this that you see because I did not give heed to what he and my other counselors advised. Tell him to help me that I be freed from these torments . . . . because if he and my friends bend their efforts to it, I shall quickly be liberated. . ." (I set out on my errand) and on my way I saw a church wherein, when I had entered, I found Bishop Hincmar, and his clerics with him, vested and about to sing Mass. I told him everything that King Charles had commanded me. Then immediately I went back to the spot where the King had lain; I found him now in a lightsome place, sound again of body, attired in his royal robes, and he said to me: "See how much your errand has helped me!"[36]

Thus wrote Hincmar in 877. When one has cut away all the vivid, medieval imaginings about the tortures of the souls in Purgatory, this at least, holds firm: for Hincmar, as for us, the Mass was a storehouse of strength that worked wonders for the pious dead.

---

[33] *PL*, CXXV, 844ab.

[34] Cf. J. Pohle-A. Preuss, *Eschatology* (7th ed., St. Louis, 1937), p. 79; and L. Billot, *Quaestiones de Novissimis* (6th ed., Rome, 1924), p. 95 ff.

[35] Hincmar's (and Bernold's) vagueness as to the *place* of Purgatory is natural enough in the absence of revelation on the matter. For the reasons behind the common view that Purgatory lies in the lower regions of our earth cf. Canty, pp. 58–103.

[36] *PL*, CXXV, 1116c–1117b. This section of the *Vision* is reproduced in Flodoard, *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae*, III, 18 (*MGH*, SS, XIII, 509); the whole work is summarized in Marcus Landau: *Hölle und Fegfuer in Volksglaube, Dichtung und Kirchenlehre* (Heidelberg, 1909), p. 13.

Trent was still seven hundred years in the future and II Lyons four centuries off, and yet their teaching was already exceptionally well synthesized in phrases that are no more than *obiter dicta* in a too little known canonist of the middle ninth century.

HENRY G. J. BECK.

*Immaculate Conception Seminary,*
*Darlington, New Jersey.*

# PEACE IN THE SCRIPTURES

Peace, to judge from the texts in the Scriptures which mention it, is a state of tranquillity contrasted with fear and with war, a state divine, closely connected with justice and with wisdom. God, the Creator of mankind, being good, wants man to share in this divine state of peace and offers it as a reward to stimulate man to serve Him faithfully. To the followers of Christ, furthermore, is offered a special kind of peace which none but He can give.

God arranged that man should have the peace which He desired to give to him, and have it in His own special way, by sending One who should restore the order on which God's peace with man was originally based by atoning for sin which disrupted that order; and who should reunite all men, removing a barrier which had been set up between men in order to preserve the tradition of the promise of the Peacemaker to come. Those who received this peace were to offer it to other men and if these other men should prove worthy it was to be theirs. Such worthiness was to be proved by a demonstration of love for the law of God.

That a man is unworthy of this peace is shown by wickedness, by lack of a salutary fear of God, and by resisting God. It is not alone unworthiness, however, which deprives a man of peace, for malicious men may be responsible for his loss of peace, at least as regards life here on earth. These malicious men will be found even to the end of time, so complete peace cannot be hoped for here on earth.

There is a false peace which men tell themselves they have, though it is not the real peace which they desire. Even wicked men seem to enjoy a certain peace on this earth, but that is not an indication that they are to enjoy the true eternal peace. So great is man's desire for peace that he may not realize that talk of peace is at times a cloak for injustice or a false assurance from leaders who, having gone astray from God, have no peace to offer their followers even though they prate glibly of it. The false sense of security which arises from this false peace is dangerous and will be the undoing of those who are not wary.

Peace gives way to war and war to peace upon this earth where there is nothing new under the sun. Those who would be faithful to God are always in danger of being disturbed by those who are hostile to Him and consequently to them that follow Him, but this disturbance is only a forecast of the cleavage which will become apparent when the final judgment is made. Peace may also be taken away by God as a punishment for those who have not obeyed His commandments.

Even though it is difficult to bring about peace upon earth, and even though there will always be those who will upset the order of things in this world; still, those who are truly children of God will always seek to bring about peace on earth and for their efforts they will be blessed.

Men are exhorted to be converted and to enjoy the peace of God. They are exhorted to pray for it, since it is a gift which God may or may not grant at His pleasure. Christians, especially, are to be at peace with God, with their fellow-Christians, and with all the world, so far as possible.

In these days, consequently, when many men in many places are striving for peace in the world, the duty of the true follower of Christ is clear. He must do all in his power to be a peacemaker, striving to bring about that true peace which is based on the love of the law of God, nor must he neglect that closer union of men in Christ which God intends to be the method of bringing His peace to earth. Though he may realize that there will always be men who will tend to upset the peace for which he strives, the Christian must prudently labor to offset these tendencies in order that the great gift of peace may come in so far as possible in this life, if he truly wishes to be called a child of God, i.e. to attain his own salvation.

That the fore-going is truly to be deduced from passages of Sacred Scripture becomes apparent if one considers the texts indicating something of the nature of peace, how it may or may not be obtained, whether or not it is permanent, what reward is in store for peacemakers, and making exhortations to men that they be men of peace.

There are, of course, still other texts in which the word "peace" occurs in some phrase, e.g. "Prince of Peace" (Is. 9:6), "way of peace" (Is. 59:8), "son of peace" (Luke 10:6), "God of peace" (Rom. 15:33, 16:20; 1 Cor. 14:33; 2 Cor. 13:11; Phil. 4:9; 1 Thess. 5:23; Hebr. 13:20), "Lord of peace" (2 Thess. 2:16), "bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3), and "gospel of peace" (Eph. 6:15); or the word occurs in expressions indicating that peace is desired for some one, e.g. "Peace be to my brethren and to thee, and peace to thy house, and peace to all that thou hast" (1 Kings 25:6), "peace be to you" (1 Par. 12:18; Tob.

12:17; Luke 24:36; John 20:19, 21), "peace be to this house" (Matt. 10:12; Luke 10:5), "go in peace" (Judith 8:34; Luke 7:50, 8:48), etc. (Ps. 121:7, 124:5; Eccli. 50:25; Rom. 1:7, 2:10, 15:13; Gal. 6:16; Phil. 4:7; Col. 3:15; Apoc. 1:4).

### NATURE OF PEACE

It is true that there does not seem to be in the Scriptures an explicit definition of the word "peace," but this indicates merely that it is to be taken in its usual sense of tranquillity, both external and internal. It is contrasted in the texts with fear and with war as an indication by indirection of its nature. Thus we read in Jeremias, "We looked for peace and no good came: *for* a time of healing, and behold fear" (8:15), or, "For thus saith the Lord: We have heard a voice of terror: there is fear and no peace" (30:5). Again we read in Paralipomenon, "He built also strong cities in Juda, for he was quiet, and there had no wars risen in his time, the Lord giving peace" (2 Par. 14:6).

The connection between peace and justice is frequently expressed as when Isaias says, "And the work of justice shall be peace, and the service of justice quietness, and security for ever. And my people shall sit in the beauty of peace, and in the tabernacles of confidence, and in wealthy rest" (Is. 32:17–18). Lest there be any mistake in the matter, St. Paul wrote in the same vein, "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but justice, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. For he that in this serveth Christ, pleaseth God, and is approved of men" (Rom. 14:17–18), as the Psalmist had already sung, "In his days shall justice spring up, and abundance of peace, till the moon be taken away" (Ps. 71:7).[1]

What could be a more forceful presentation of the idea that peace goes hand in hand with justice than the statements of St. James? "And the fruit of justice is sown in peace, to them that make peace. From whence are wars and contentions among you? Are they not hence, from your concupiscences, which war in your members? You covet, and have not; you kill, and envy, and can not obtain. You contend and war, and you have not, because you ask not. You ask, and receive not; because you ask amiss: that you may consume it on your concupiscences" (James 3:18–4:3). A man's concupiscences, then, warring within him, destroy the peace which should be his; and being unsatisfied with what they find within man himself they drive him to war with other men for goods of this world which he may or may not thus obtain, but which obtained do not satiate the concupiscence which craved them so that man is still not at peace even when he gets them. These things are not really good for man, so God, when asked for them, does not deign to hear such a prayer. The conclusion is logical: to have true peace man must first understand what is good for him that he may ask for what God is willing to grant, in which case he will no longer find himself upset internally nor will he find it necessary to make war on other men to obtain these things since God will give them if they are really to a man's advantage.

---

[1] Cf. also *Ps.* 84:11.

Peace is therefore said to be the product of wisdom, of that wisdom which comes from God. Thus we read in Proverbs that wisdom's ways are beautiful ways, and all her paths are peaceable.[2] Baruch exhorts us to learn where is wisdom, where is strength, where is understanding; that we may know also where is length of days and life, where is the light of the eyes, and peace.[3] St. James calls this a "wisdom that is from above," a divine wisdom, which is chaste, peaceable, modest, easy to be persuaded, consenting to the good, full of mercy and good fruits, without judging, without dissimulation.[4]

The fact that peace is so closely connected with that wisdom which is from above gives us a clue as to how it may be obtained.

### HOW PEACE IS OBTAINED

While the people of ancient times worshipped many gods, gods of war as well as gods of peace, it is pointed out in the scriptures that the one true God "is not the God of dissension, but of peace,"[5] Whose "place is in peace."[6] As God of peace He creates peace and offers it as a reward for those who serve Him faithfully. He is represented as saying, "For I know the thoughts that I think towards you,... thoughts of peace, and not of affliction" (Jer. 29:11).[7] We read further that He "delights in the peace of his servant."[8]

To the followers of Christ, furthermore, there is offered a special kind of peace, one which only He can give, one which is to endure even though there are to be many adversaries ranged against them.

---

[2] Cf. *Prov.* 3:17.

[3] Cf. *Bar.* 3:14.

[4] Cf. *James* 3:17.

[5] *1 Cor.* 14:33.

[6] *Ps.* 75:2–3.

[7] Cf. also *Lev.* 26:6; *Ps.* 28:11, 147:14; *Is.* 26:12, 45:7, 57:19, 66:15; *Jer.* 29:11.

[8] *Ps.* 34:27.

This is a peace which is of His kingdom, a peace with God and with other members of the kingdom, men of good will; not a peace such as is to be found in this world, impermanent because it is not a peace with God. It is of this He spoke when He said, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, do I give unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, nor let it be afraid" (John 14:27).

Though God sincerely wanted mankind to enjoy peace, the sin of Adam and Eve had destroyed the order on which was based the peace which He originally gave to them. Hence He arranged that One should come Who would bring about the desired peace, and informed them of this arrangement that they might have some glimmering of hope even when they were punished for their disobedience, a hope that peace was not gone forever between them and their God. Isaias restated this prophecy when he said, "For a child is born to us, and a son is given to us, and the government is upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, God the Mighty, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of Peace. His empire shall be multiplied, and there shall be no end of peace: he shall sit upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom; to establish it and strengthen it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth and for ever: the zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this" (Is. 9:6–7).

Peace is based, of course, on order, so the order originally upset had, logically, to be restored that peace might be restored. Therefore, the One Who was to bring peace back between man and God was to do this by restoring the proper relationship between man and God, atoning for the sin which had disrupted it in the first place. "But he was wounded for our iniquities, he was bruised for our sins: the chastisement of our peace *was* upon him, and by his bruises we are healed" (Is. 53:5), is the way Isaias expressed it.

When He arrived Who was to bring this peace which God desired to give to men, the fact that peace was then being restored was clearly stated, both by Zachary and by the manifestation to the shepherds who heard the angels sing, "Glory to God in the highest; and on earth peace to men of good will (*εὐδοκίας*)" (Luke 2:14). Then did that first tiny ray of hope, which had waxed ever brighter with each successive assurance through the prophets, burst into full glory "to enlighten them that sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death: to direct our feet into the way of peace" (Luke 1:79).

The first effect of the work of this Peacemaker was to restore peace with God, so that His disciples coming near the descent of Mount Olivet were moved to bless Him and exclaim, "peace in heaven."[9] This reconciliation He effected by uniting all men with Himself in His body, the Church, because it pleased God "through him to reconcile all things into himself, making peace through the blood of his cross, both as to the things that are on earth, and the things that are in heaven" (Col. 1:19-20). The Peacemaker Himself, of course, was at peace with God, as the Persons of the Blessed Trinity are at peace among Themselves, so when He joins a man to Himself He makes that man enjoy peace not only with Himself but with the other Persons of the Trinity, peace with God in its complete sense. This condition, however, of union with Him seems to be an essential element of this true peace.

We are told that Christ joins men with Himself in a body, the Church, of which He is the Head. That means that more than one individual human being is joined with Him and, consequently, that these individual human beings are joined among themselves in and through Him. Thus is brought about the second effect of the work of this Peacemaker, namely, peace among men, through the removal of a barrier which God had erected and preserved among men for centuries that the tradition of His promise of a Redeemer might be the better kept. St. Paul indicates this union of individual men clearly when he writes, "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and breaking down the middle wall of partition, the enmities in his flesh: making void the law of commandments *contained* in decrees; that he might make the two in himself into one new man, making peace; and might reconcile both to God in one body by the cross, killing the enmities in himself" (Eph. 2:14-16). The distinction whereby some men were close to God while others were left "afar off" was thus abolished that all might be united in approaching God. The penchant which men have for suspecting strangers and foreigners and warring against those with whom they are not acquainted was thus to be removed by making men "fellow citizens with the saints, and the domestics of God,"[10] members of the household of God in which all should dwell as brothers in the harmony and peace which exists in the ideal family.

Conscious of this peace which had been restored between themselves and God and between themselves and their fellow-men, the followers

[9] *Luke* 19:38.

[10] *Eph.* 2:19.

of Christ, members of this body, the Church, were to have the salutation of peace frequently on their lips, offering peace to all with whom they had occasion to deal.[11]

Though this peace was restored as far as God was concerned through the work of the Peacemaker and though God desired all men to enjoy the peace which had been thus restored and though those who had it were to share it He exacted the fulfillment of certain conditions on the part of man before man should be privileged to enjoy this peace. Thus we read, "And if that house be worthy, your peace shall come upon it; but if it be not worthy, your peace shall return to you" (Matt. 10:13).[12]

If a man is "meek,"[13] if he is "converted to the heart,"[14] if he forgets not the law,[15] and his heart keeps God's commandments,[16] his ways will be pleasing to the Lord Who will convert even his enemies to peace,[17] for peace is a reward for those who have hoped in Him.[18]

It is because these conditions are exacted and because God wants man to have peace that He sometimes chastises a man in this life in order that he may correct his ways and so attain peace in the end. St. Paul expresses this when he says, "Now all chastisement for the present indeed seemeth not to bring with it joy, but sorrow: but afterwards it will yield, to them that are exercised by it, the most peaceable fruit of justice" (Hebr. 12:11).

This chastisement, however, is a rather extraordinary remedy which God is not anxious to use, so He warns man to walk in His ways and to try to learn what he should do in order to become worthy of this peace. Baruch points out, "For if thou hadst walked in the way of God, thou hadst surely dwelt in peace forever" (Bar. 3:13). In the same way Christ lamented that Jerusalem had not known in its day the things that were to its peace, with the result that it would be beaten flat to the ground, not having known the time of its visitation.[19]

A love for the law of God is the quality in man which gains for him the peace of God, as it is written, "They that trust in him, shall understand the truth: and they that are faithful in love shall rest in him: for grace and peace is to his elect. But the wicked shall be punished according to their own devices: who have neglected the just, and have revolted from the Lord" (Wis. 3:9–10).[20]

---

[11] Cf. *Matt.* 10:12; *Luke* 10:5.

[12] Cf. also *Luke* 10:6.

[13] *Ps.* 36:11.

[14] *Ps.* 84:9.

[15] Cf. *Prov.* 3:1–2.

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] Cf. *Prov.* 16:7.

[18] Cf. *Is.* 26:3.

[19] Cf. *Luke* 19:42–44.

Realizing that God wants him to have peace, and that if he serves God he shall have it, man can have confidence when he does serve God that peace is his. The Psalmist thus remarks, "But I have cried to God: and the Lord will save me. Evening and morning, and at noon I will speak and declare: and he shall hear my voice. He shall redeem my soul in peace from them that draw near to me: for among many they were with me" (Ps. 54:17–19).[21]

It is not, however, God's intention that there shall be here on earth that perfect peace which is the final reward of His elect in heaven, hence even though a man may be at peace with God and with those of his fellow-men who are also at peace with God, it is still possible that other men, maliciously inclined, may disturb his peace at least as concerns his relations with them. Christ warned His followers of what was liable to occur that in Him they might have peace, even though in the world they should have distress.[22] St. Paul likewise pointed out that if the unbeliever should choose to depart he was to be allowed to depart, "for a brother or sister is not under servitude in such *cases*. But God hath called us in peace" (1 Cor. 7:15).

We are likewise warned that God created man incorruptible and to the image of His own likeness. It is through the envy of the devil that death came into the world, and those persons follow the devil that are of his side. The souls of the just, however, are in the hand of God, and the torment of death shall not touch them. Though in the sight of the unwise they seem to die and their departure is taken for misery, and their going away from us for utter destruction, still they are really in peace,[23] for God has His own judgment to render on these matters, which is not the judgment of this world.

Peace is not alone the gift of God, however, something which depends in every way upon Him, for at least as to its preservation it depends upon a man's watchfulness and strength. It is not enough to be thankful that one possesses peace, one must also take care to be alert and to keep up his strength in order to preserve the peace which God has given to him. "When a strong man armed keepeth his court, those things are in peace which he possesseth" (Luke 11:21), is the observation which Our Lord makes on this point, that we should not lazily leave to God a work which we should perform ourselves, with the assistance, of course, of His grace. He is not a wise man who goes along blissfully unaware that there may be men who will disturb his peace, but rather is he wise who loving peace nevertheless keeps his powder dry and his eyes open.

---

[20] Cf. also *Ps*. 118:165.

[21] Cf. also *Ps*. 4:9–10; *Is*. 38:17.

[22] Cf. *John* 16:33.

[23] Cf. *Wis*. 2:23–3:3.

Peace, then, is a gift of God, restored to us through the work of the Peacemaker Whom He promised to send and did send. This peace is first with God, and second with other men who become part of the body, the organization which the Peacemaker set up. It is given to us if we fulfill certain conditions of loving the law of God and striving to serve Him properly. It may be disturbed by those who are hostile to God and to the members of His organization, at least in this world, but it is likely to be preserved if one is strong and alert to prevent disturbances of one's peace. To show more clearly, however, the conditions required for peace and the possibility of disturbance by malicious men, the scriptures present by contrast the reasons why peace is not obtained.

### WHY PEACE IS NOT OBTAINED

Even though God is willing to give peace to men, the iniquities with which man is frequently tainted prevent him from receiving the peace which is offered. The hand, indeed, of the Lord is not shortened that it cannot save, neither is his ear heavy that it cannot hear. Man's iniquities, however, divide between him and his God and his sins hide His face from him that He should not hear. When man's hands are defiled with blood, and his fingers with iniquity, when his lips have spoken lies and his tongue uttereth iniquity, God will not grant him peace. When there is none that calls upon justice, neither is there any one that judges truly, but they trust in a mere nothing, and speak vanities, when they have conceived labour, and brought forth iniquity, their feet run to evil, and make haste to shed innocent blood, and their thoughts are unprofitable thoughts, and wasting and destruction are in their ways, then truly "they have not known the way of peace and there is no judgment in their steps: their paths are become crooked to them, every one that treadeth in them, knoweth no peace" (Is. 59:1–4,7–8).

Fundamentally it is the lack of a salutary fear of God and of reverence for Him which prevents man from obtaining this peace.[24] Those, therefore, who resist God, acting contrary to His law, are unable to obtain that peace which only He can give.[25] Thus it is pointed out that "the wicked are like the raging sea, which cannot rest, and the waves thereof cast up dirt and mire. There is no peace to the wicked, saith the Lord God" (Is. 57:20–21).

Men themselves are a danger to peace, "for a passionate man kindleth strife, and a sinful man will trouble his friends, and bring in debate in the midst of them that are at peace. For as the wood of the forest is, so the fire burneth: and as a man's strength is, so shall his anger be, and according to his riches he shall increase his anger. A hasty contention kindleth a fire: and a hasty quarrel sheddeth blood: and a tongue that beareth witness bringeth death. If thou blow the spark, it shall burn as a fire: and if thou spit upon it, it shall be quenched: both come out of the mouth. The whisperer and the double tongued is accursed: for he hath troubled many that were at peace" (Eccli. 28:11–15).

Complete peace, evidently, can never be obtained while this world lasts; for there will be, so long as time runs on, such men who will disturb the peace which God would give. St. Paul warns his disciple Timothy, "Know also this, that in the last days, shall come dangerous times. Men shall be lovers of themselves, covetous, haughty, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, ungrateful, wicked, without affection, without peace, slanderers, incontinent, unmerciful, without kindness, traitors, stubborn, puffed up, and lovers of pleasures more than of God: having an appearance indeed of godliness, but denying the power thereof" (2 Tim. 3:1–5). This need not be discouraging to one who hopes for peace, but it should be an admonition to be strong and alert at all times, not a day-dreamer lost in pictures of a beautiful but unrealistic world.

## FALSE PEACE

Since man is prone to delude himself, the Scriptures warn that not everything which appears to man as peace is peace in reality. There is a text in the Book of Wisdom which seems much to the point in this regard. "And it was not enough for them to err about the knowledge of God, but whereas they lived in a great war of ignorance, they call so many and so great evils peace. For either they sacrifice their own children, or use hidden sacrifices, or keep watches full of madness, so that now they neither keep life, nor marriage undefiled, but one killeth another through envy, or grieveth him by adultery: and all things are mingled together, blood, murder, theft and dissimulation, corruption and unfaithfulness, tumults and perjury, disquieting of the good, forgetfulness of God, defiling of souls, changing of nature, disorder in marriage, and the irregularity of adultery and uncleanness" (Wis. 14:22–26).

---

[24] Cf. *Ps.* 13:3; *Eccli.* 1:22.

[25] Cf. *Job* 9:1–4.

Another false peace which deceives men is that of the wicked who seem to have a certain peace in this life while the good suffer, but we are assured that in the end everything will be explained. The Psalmist observed, "But my feet were almost moved; my steps had well nigh slipped. Because I had a zeal on occasion of the wicked, seeing the prosperity of sinners (*pacem peccatorum videns*). . . . I studied that I might know this thing, it is a labour in my sight: until I go into the sanctuary of God, and understand concerning their last ends. But indeed for deceits thou hast put it to them: when they were lifted up thou hast cast them down" (Ps. 72:2–3,16–18).

Man's desire for peace is so great and so well known that cunning men use talk of peace at times to deceive their fellow-men that they may work their injustice the more readily under the cloak of a false peace. The Psalmist prays that he may not be drawn away together with the wicked, and that with the workers of iniquity he may not be destroyed, i.e. with those who speak peace with their neighbour, but evils are in their hearts.[26] Jeremias adds, "Their tongue is a piercing arrow, it hath spoken deceit: with his mouth one speaketh peace with his friend, and secretly he lieth in wait for him" (Jer. 9:8).

The wise man will, further, not be lead astray by assurances of peace even though they come from personages of some importance, for it may well be that these personages, not being themselves at peace with God, have no peace to offer though they may give solemn asseverations that all is well. The wise man will look to the facts and judge for himself whether the peace of which they speak is real or not. Jeremias affords us an example of this attitude when he scornfully exclaims, "How do you say we are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us? Indeed the lying pen of the scribes hath wrought falsehood. The wise men are confounded, they are dismayed, and taken: for they have cast away the word of the Lord, and there is no wisdom in them. Therefore will I give their women to strangers, their fields to others for an inheritance:

---

[26] Cf. *Ps.* 27:3.

because from the least even to the greatest all follow covetousness: from the prophet even to the priest all deal deceitfully. And they healed the breach of the daughter of my people disgracefully, saying: Peace, peace: when there was no peace" (Jer. 8:8–11).[27]

It is the more necessary that a man be wise in this matter and be not taken in by false assurances of peace and be not deluded as to his own state, since the false sense of security thus engendered leaves him unprepared for the swift judgment of the Lord. St. Paul, ever solicitous for the welfare of his brethren, warns, "But of the times and moments, brethren, you need not, that we should write to you; for yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord shall so come, as a thief in the night. For when they shall say, peace and security; then shall sudden destruction come upon them, as the pains upon her that is with child, and they shall not escape" (1 Thess. 5:1–3).

### PERMANENCE OF PEACE

Though it is quite obvious from what has been said thus far that, for all the good will shown by God and by man in regard to peace, man's enjoyment of peace totters in the balance so long as there are in this world men with malice in their hearts, and that these men shall have their brief days until judgment comes, it seems advisable to recall those clear words, "All things have their season, and in their times all things pass under heaven. . . . . A time of war, and a time of peace" (Eccl. 3:1,8), cynical though it may sound when men are discussing ways and means of securing a permanent peace on earth.

Paradox though it seem, the Christian who follows Christ as the One Who was foretold as the Prince of Peace, the One Who would direct our feet into the way of peace, the Christian who is exhorted to be a peacemaker if he would be called a child of God, is warned that he is not likely to find peace with all men on this earth. He is comforted that God cares for him and will watch over him, but he is reminded that God allows both the good and bad to live that the final separation may have its basis on the separation voluntarily embraced by men during their lives on earth.

> Behold I send you as sheep in the midst of wolves. Be ye therefore wise as serpents and simple as doves. But beware of men. For they will deliver you up in councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues. And you shall be brought before governors, and before kings for my sake, for a testimony to them and to the Gentiles: but when they shall deliver you up,

---

[27] Cf. also *Jer.* 6:13–14.

> take no thought how or what to speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what to speak. For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you. The brother also shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the son, and the children shall rise up against their parents, and shall put them to death. And you shall be hated by all men for my name's sake: but he that shall persevere unto the end, he shall be saved. And when they shall persecute you in this city, flee into another. Amen I say to you, you shall not finish all the cities of Israel, till the Son of man come. The disciple is not above the master, nor the servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the goodman of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household? Therefore fear them not. For nothing is covered that shall not be revealed: nor hid, that shall not be known. That which I tell you in the dark, speak ye in the light: and that which you hear in the ear, preach ye upon the housetops. And fear ye not them that kill the body and are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him that can destroy both soul and body in hell. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore: better are you than many sparrows. Every one therefore that shall confess me before men, I will also confess him before my Father who is in heaven. But he that shall deny me before men, I will also deny him before my Father who is in heaven. Do not think that I came to send peace upon earth: I came not to send peace, but the sword. For I came to set a man at variance[28] against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's enemies shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me (Matt. 10:16–37).[29]

It seems, then, that the peace which God intended to give on earth to men of good will, or, in the other reading of the text, as a token of His good will toward men, was peace with Himself and peace with other men who should be converted to Him, but not such peace as would exclude the possibility of conflict with those who were not converted to Him. The continuation of the struggle was foreseen by St. John, "And there went out another horse *that was* red: and to him that sat thereon, it was given that he should take peace from the earth, and that they should kill one another, and a great sword was given to him" (Apoc. 6:4).

Those who destroy peace and attack the followers of Christ are to have their punishment in due time, but in the meantime they are instruments for the filling up of the number of the elect, as it is written, "And behold a pale horse, and he that sat upon him, his name was Death, and hell followed him. And power was given to him over the four parts of the earth, to kill with sword, with famine, and with death, and with the beasts of the earth. And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying: How long, O Lord (holy and true) dost thou not judge and revenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given to every one of them one; and it was said to them, that they should rest for a little time, till their fellow servants, and their brethren, who are to be slain, even as they, should be filled up" (Apoc. 6:8–11).

---

[28] By reason of the obstinate resistance of many to Him and to His doctrine.

[29] Cf. also *Luke* 12:51–53.

With the customary personal touch, however, the Scriptures admonish man that he should look to his own conduct and not blame entirely the malice of others for his loss of peace, since the withdrawal of peace may well be a punishment from God for the failure of men to live up to His commandments. Consider in this vein the words of Ezechiel, "And I will bring the worst of the nations, and they shall possess their houses: and I will make the pride of the mighty to cease, and they shall possess their sanctuary. When distress cometh upon them, they will seek for peace and there shall be none" (Ezech. 7:24–25).[30]

## PEACEMAKERS

Despite the fact that malicious men, who will eventually be punished for their wickedness, may strive to take away peace and at times succeed in doing so, those who would serve God must strive to bring about peace, for, "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God" (Matt. 5:9). St. Paul exhorts us, "If it be possible, as much as is in you, have peace with all men. Revenge not yourselves, my dearly beloved; but give place unto wrath, for it is written: 'Revenge is mine, I will repay,' saith the Lord. But 'if thy enemy be hungry, give him to eat: if he thirst, give him to drink. For, doing this, thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head.' Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil by good" (Rom. 12:18–21).

The Apostle of the Gentiles might have added that by leaving revenge to God and thus holding in check the natural reaction of our emotional nature we gain practice in that self-control which is so necessary if we are to obey the law of God in other matters. The beast aroused naturally attacks his attacker if he can; if not, he runs away. Man can, by the grace of God, control himself if he will, there is no need for him to behave like a beast. Furthermore, if we cannot trust a jungle cat, can we trust a man without self-control? We may agree with those who advocate revenge if they are on our side, but will they continue to be on our side? So long as the tiger eats the meat we throw to him he is a beautiful beast, but if he suddenly decides to eat us we are his beautiful feast.

---

[30] Cf. also *Jer.* 16:5.

Amid all the strife which is ever rampant in the world one who preaches peace is much to be desired, even as the real Preacher of Peace was desired for ages. Isaias exclaimed, "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, and that preacheth peace: of him that sheweth forth good, that preacheth salvation, that saith to Sion: Thy God shall reign!" (Is. 52:7),[31] and there is a proverb, "Deceit is in the heart of them that think evil things: but joy followeth them that take counsels of peace" (Prov. 12:20). Thus it is that one who does succeed in being at peace himself and in bringing peace to those around him will have praise always.[32]

## EXHORTATIONS

Since peace is a reward for goodness and since God wants all men to be good it is not surprising to find that men are exhorted to pursue peace as they are exhorted to do good. The Psalmist says, "Turn away from evil and do good: seek after peace and pursue it" (Ps. 33:15).

To pursue peace by one's own efforts, however, is not enough; for peace is, after all, the gift of God and man must ask through prayer that He deign to grant it. The Psalmist again suggests, "Pray ye for the things that are for the peace of Jerusalem: and abundance for them that love thee. Let peace be in thy strength: and abundance in thy towers. For the sake of my brethren, and of my neighbours, I spoke peace of thee" (Ps. 121:6–8).

Christians, by reason of their faith and baptism, are made children of God to Whom Christ has reconciled the world, hence they are exhorted to be at peace with God. "Being justified therefore by faith, let us have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1), is the way St. Paul explains it. St. Peter exhorts us to keep ourselves "blameless in peace" while awaiting the new heavens and the new earth which God has promised us.[33]

---

[31] Cf. also *Rom.* 10:15.

[32] Cf. *Eccl.* 44:6–7.

Christians are to be at peace not only with God, but likewise with their fellow-Christians as a result of the divine charity communicated to them. Christ Himself said, "have peace among you,"[34] and St. Paul follows, saying, "Therefore let us follow after the things that are of peace; and keep the things that are of edification one towards another" (Rom. 14:19). Again the Apostle of the Gentiles says, "For the rest, brethren, rejoice, be perfect, take exhortation, be of one mind, have peace; and the God of peace and of love shall be with you" (2 Cor. 13:11), and, "I therefore, a prisoner in the Lord, beseech you that you walk worthy of the vocation in which you are called, with all humility and mildness, with patience, supporting one another in charity. Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:1-3).

Finally, Christians are to set an example by being at peace with all men, Christian or non-Christian, and this that they may see God themselves. Thus St. Paul advises his disciple Timothy, "But flee thou youthful desires, and pursue justice, faith, charity, and peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart. And avoid foolish and unlearned questions, knowing that they beget strifes. But the servant of the Lord must not wrangle: but be mild towards all men, apt to teach, patient, with modesty admonishing them that resist the truth: if peradventure God may give them repentance to know the truth, and they may recover themselves from the snares of the devil, by whom they are held captive at his will" (2 Tim. 2:22–26). In the Epistle to the Hebrews the same Apostle states flatly, "Follow peace with all men, and holiness: without which no man shall see God" (Hebr. 12:14).

To those who like to dream of a "brave, new world" in which the Golden Age, long-lost if it ever existed, is to return the Scriptures with their talk of a peace dependent upon God's good will and man's correspondence with His law, of a peace which is not permanent upon this earth because there will always be those who will tend to give some indication of their choice of a future state by disturbing God's peace with men and their peace among themselves in Him must seem coldly cynical. If they prefer their dreams they will no doubt toss aside the Word of God as something which has no place in their cosmogony.

---

[33] *2 Pet.* 3:13–14.

[34] *Mark* 9:49.

The Christian, however, who is conscious that he did not create this world himself and who finds himself unable to influence its course to any great extent, or at least for any considerable period of time, i.e. in relation to the known period of its existence, and who sees no reason to believe that any other man created it or can greatly alter its course, is quite willing to learn what the real Creator thinks about the matter of peace and to plan his actions accordingly. He may realize that it will be difficult for him to bring about peace upon this earth, but desirous of being a child of God he will not allow himself to be dismayed by the opposition which he is warned to expect, but will rather plan to meet such opposition so that by weakening its force he may the more effectively work for the true peace which he knows the Creator wants him to attempt to bring about.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN.

*The Catholic University of America,*
*Washington, D. C.*

# THE CATHOLIC LAWYER

The profession of a lawyer offers a career that is both honorable and lucrative. To one who is imbued with humanitarian ideals it affords abundant opportunity of assisting the poor and the needy to preserve their civil rights. The lawyer who guides his conduct by the principles of Christian faith regards his professional activities as a means of defending and proclaiming the unchangeable law of God, of which every just civil law is a participation. Some of those whom the Church has raised to the honor of the altar were lawyers, such as St. Ives, the patron of lawyers, and St. Thomas More, defender of the faith and martyr. More recent is Contardo Ferrini, who taught law in a secular university, and the cause of whose canonization is now in progress. Evidently, there is no incompatibility between an active and successful law career and an exemplary Catholic life.

However, there are lawyers who profess to be practical Catholics but who, in their professional activities, fail to measure up to the moral standards prescribed by their Church. We are not referring merely to those disreputable individuals who are known to be the protectors of gangsters and the abettors of dishonest transactions, and who themselves are only one step ahead of the law. Strange to say, there are some in this category of lawyers who believe themselves to be excellent Catholics. Of course, they are a disgrace to the Catholic Church. But we are concerned primarily with those Catholic lawyers who stay safely within the limits of legal immunity, who are in no danger of being disbarred or indicted by any human tribunal, and yet who transgress, at least occasionally, the ethical code laid down for them by Catholic theology. There are, indeed, mitigating circumstances for such conduct. These lawyers associate daily with men and women whose only rule of action is: "Don't get caught." A good proportion of these Catholic lawyers attended secular colleges and law schools, and never had any formal instruction in Catholic ethics. Their violations of Catholic principles are oftentimes entirely indeliberate. Yet, they should be familiar with the teachings of their Church pertinent to their profession and with the chief applications of these teachings to practical cases. For, in the moral debacle of the modern world it is Catholics who have the first responsibility to support the laws of God in their particular spheres of life. And priests who have the spiritual care of lawyers, whether as pastors or as confessors, should consider it a duty to see that these men are properly instructed in their rights and obligations according to the teachings of the Catholic Church.

The cases in which the lawyer's services may be employed are, in general, either civil or criminal. By civil cases are meant those in which the acquisition or the retention of property is at stake or some civil right is being litigated. The first principle to guide the lawyer in reference to such actions is that he may not undertake a civil case which he knows to be unjust on the part of the one who seeks his services. This principle holds even in the event that the lawyer is quite sure that the opposing party, though in the right, will not be able to prove his claim and will lose the case. When a lawyer is presented with such a case and has studied it sufficiently to assure himself that it is unjust, he must inform the prospective client of this fact and decline to prosecute it.

A civil case which is only probably just can be undertaken, and the lawyer may and should use all lawful means to establish the claim of his client. However, if in the course of the process it becomes evident that the client is entirely in the wrong, the lawyer must withdraw from the case. This teaching of Catholic theology is supported by the *Canons of Professional Ethics*, adopted by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York on December 13, 1938, which include as one of the reasons justifying the withdrawal of an attorney or counsel from employment once assumed "when a lawyer discovers that his client has no case."[1] St. Thomas states the matter thus: "If in the beginning the lawyer believed the case to be just, and afterward in the procedure it becomes evident that it is unjust, he must not betray the case, in such wise as to help the other side, or reveal the secrets of his case to the other party. But he can and must abandon the case or induce his client to yield or to compromise without injury to his adversary."[2] This last phrase brings out the point that even a compromise with an opponent is unjust if it deprives him of something to which he certainly has a right, unless for the sake of a quick and final settlement of the matter he is quite willing to yield his right to this extent.

The Catholic moral teaching on the obligation of restitution should give the lawyer food for serious thought. For, according to this teaching, a lawyer who knowingly undertakes an unjust case shares with his client the obligation of making restitution to all who, in consequence, suffer unjustly. This obligation extends not only to the portion of the unjust gains the lawyer himself may have obtained but also to the entire loss suffered by the injured parties, in the event that the client and others who have profited are unwilling or unable to restore their share. Again, the lawyer who, for personal gain, induces someone to prosecute a civil case which he (the lawyer) foresees will certainly be unsuccessful is bound by the law of God to make up to his client for the financial loss he thereby sustained, if it is evident that his persuasion was the effective cause of the prosecution of the case. Similarly, the lawyer who unnecessarily prolongs a case, so that his fee will be larger, is bound to restore the amount that exceeds a reasonable stipend. Finally, if a case is lost because of the lawyer's culpable neglect in studying the pertinent legal points or in conducting the proceedings, the lawyer must recompense his client to the amount it is reasonably presumed he would have gained if the lawyer had done his duty.

---

[1] *The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, Year Book, 1941*, p. 164.

[2] *Sum. Theol.*, II–II, q. 71, a. 3, ad 2.

It may happen that a lawyer, after having defended and won a case in all good faith, discovers that justice was certainly on the other side. In such an event he would be bound to restore only that portion of the unjust gain which he still has in his possession. This would be verified only in the supposition that what he received was given explicitly as a definite portion of the gain. If his earnings came as a fee from his client, he could retain them (even though actually they were taken from money gained through the litigation), leaving to the client the obligation of making complete restitution.

In prosecuting suits for damages to person or to property the lawyer must be most conscientious. It is a sad reflection on the standards of honesty prevailing nowadays that so many persons are ready to have recourse to every form of deception, and even to perjury, in order to be successful in establishing a claim for damages. There seems to be a notion, even among some Catholics, that it is permissible to use any means whatsoever to extort money from a large corporation, such as a railroad company or an insurance company. The honest Catholic lawyer, when requested to press a claim for damages that is evidently unjust, will not only refuse his services but will take occasion to give the petitioner a lecture on the virtue of justice.

The corporation lawyer who confines himself to expounding honestly and adequately to the members of the firm the points of law relative to their business transactions is not responsible if they utilize the information to transact dealings that violate the divine laws of justice and charity, but are not punishable by civil law, provided such transgressions are not too frequent. But if the lawyer discovers that his exposition of legal technicalities is being directed regularly toward an evil end—for example, toward protecting the company in its refusal to pay the workers a living wage, or toward circumventing laws against the sale of birth-control devices—he must withdraw from his position, lest he be guilty of unjustifiable co-operation in these grave sins.

In the matter of wills the Catholic lawyer should know that it is a moot question among theologians whether a will which has all the requirements from the standpoint of the natural law but is invalid in the eyes of the civil law is valid in the forum of conscience.[3] Since the affirmative view is solidly probable, it can be followed in practice. Thus, if a dying man says to a friend: "John, I want you to have my watch when I am gone," John can take possession of the watch after the testator's death, even though there is no mention of this legacy in his written will. Of course, this presumes that the dying man knew what he was doing. On the other hand, the natural heir may lawfully make use of the opposite opinion, which is also probable,—namely, that the dispositions of the civil law take precedence over a will devoid of the legal requirements. Thus, in the case just given, the son of the deceased man, to whom the legal will gives all his father's personal property, may invoke the law to gain possession of the watch, even though he knew his father actually wished it to go to his friend.

Similarly, a written will which is technically defective is not binding on the natural heir, who may seek to have it declared invalid by the court; and a lawyer may collaborate in such an attempt within the limits of honest means. A case would be this: The deceased left most of his property to a distant relative, and the son of the deceased is trying to have the will invalidated. If the son's lawyer can discover that some requirement of law was omitted when the will was drawn up, he may, with a safe conscience, seek to have it annulled on this score, so that the procedure for one who died intestate will be followed.

However, there is one exception to these rules. According to Canon Law: "In last wills in favor of the Church, let the formalities of civil law be observed, if this can be done; if these have been omitted, let the heirs be admonished to fulfill the will of the testator."[4] Hence, if it is evident that the deceased willed that a portion of his estate should be used for the erection of a mission chapel, a burse for a seminary, etc., his wishes must be observed in conscience by his heirs, even though the mode by which he expressed this legacy was not a formal will, recognized by law. A Catholic lawyer who is serving in a case of this nature is ordinarily bound, by charity and loyalty to the Church, to remind the heirs of their obligation.

---

[3] Tanquerey, *Synopsis Theologiae Moralis*, 9th ed. (1931), III, n. 675.

[4] *Codex Juris Canonici*, Can. 1513, §2.

May a Catholic lawyer undertake a divorce case? Generally speaking, the answer must be in the negative. As was stated previously in this series of articles on Catholics in public life, a Catholic judge is usually permitted to pronounce a decree of divorce according to the civil law, when a case is presented to him which he cannot avoid without grave inconvenience.[5] But it is a different matter with a lawyer, who is free to accept cases or to refuse them. If the divorce is being sought for a marriage that is invalid in the eyes of God, such as the civil marriage of a Catholic, the lawyer may accept the case, particularly if the objective of the party seeking the divorce is to prepare the way for a lawful Catholic marriage. Again, if a lawyer has sufficient assurance that a civil divorce is being sought in the case of a valid marriage merely to protect one of the parties from molestation or to secure a financial settlement, and there is no danger of an attempted remarriage by either party, he may take the case. However, this presupposes that he will thereby cause no scandal. Moreover, the Catholic lawyer should know that the Third Council of Baltimore forbids Catholics in the United States to approach the civil court for the purpose of obtaining a separation *a thoro et mensa* without first consulting the ecclesiastical authorities.[6] It would be the proper thing for a Catholic lawyer to bring this legislation to the notice of a Catholic seeking his services for the introduction of a suit for a civil separation.

However, the ordinary divorce suit in this country is simply a preparatory step toward a forbidden remarriage. Accordingly, apart from the cases mentioned in the previous paragraph, the Catholic lawyer must practically always refuse to prosecute a petition for divorce, even though the parties involved are non-Catholics, presumably believing in good faith that their marriage can be dissolved. Some theologians argue that, since it is precisely the remarriage rather than the divorce that is intrinsically wrong, a lawyer could be justified in accepting a divorce case for a very grave reason—for example, if he were in dire financial straits, and this case offers the only avenue of

[5] *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CX, 6 (June, 1944), pp. 430 f.

[6] *Conc. Plen. Balt. III, Acta et Decreta,* (Baltimore, Md., 1886), n. 126.

relief.[7] But even this exception would not hold if the danger of scandal were present—which is usually the case when a Catholic lawyer is appearing for the complainant, and is always verified if the party seeking the divorce is a Catholic.

The general principle governing criminal trials is that the accused has a right to be free from punishment until he is proved with moral certainty to be guilty. Accordingly, the lawyer for the defendant, even though he knows that his client committed the crime with which he is charged, can lawfully utilize all objectively honest means to avert the sentence of condemnation. In other words, he can point out gaps and inconsistencies in the evidence adduced by the prosecutor, emphasize facts that would seem to indicate that the accused could not have been at the scene of the crime, relate instances that picture the defendant as a person of integrity, try to invalidate the indictment on legal grounds, etc. Of course, he may not manufacture evidence, or induce witnesses to perjure themselves. But, as long as he confines himself to facts that are objectively true, he may present them in such a manner that the jury will be inclined to render a verdict of not guilty.

If a witness for the defence, without the foreknowledge or connivance of the lawyer, gives false testimony, the lawyer has no obligation to point out the perjury. When it comes to the summing up of the evidence, however, he would be in a difficult situation, especially if the false statement had a vital bearing on the case. In any event, he could not propose the perjured testimony as something which he himself regards as true. At most, he could assert that the witness has made the statement in question, and then draw a hypothetical conclusion, somewhat after this fashion: "John Smith testified that he saw the accused in New York at 7 o'clock on the evening of the crime. If the defendant were in New York at that time, he could not have committed the crime of which he is accused." It must be admitted, however, that this solution stretches casuistry close to the breaking point.

The lawyer is bound to observe the most exacting type of secrecy, professional secrecy, regarding what he has learned from his client in the discharge of his professional duties. However, there are times when a lawyer would have the right and the duty to reveal information acquired in this way—namely, when otherwise some grave harm would happen to society or to some individual. This is especially the case when the lawyer discovers that his client is planning to commit a crime. It may be that the client is gravely incensed at some one who testified against him at the trial, and intends to give him a severe beating. In this supposition the lawyer would be obliged in charity to prevent this wrong by warning the individual in question or, if necessary, the police authorities. Similarly, if a lawyer finds out that the man whom he is defending on the charge of robbery has a large amount of stolen property hidden in a certain place, he should reveal this fact, so that restitution may be made, if he cannot persuade the thief himself to return the plunder. It must be remembered that the retention of stolen property is just as truly a crime as the actual stealing. Bearing this in mind, we can conclude that the *Canons of Professional Ethics* of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York agree on this point with the teachings of Catholic theology: "The announced intention of a client to commit a crime is not included within the confidences which he [the lawyer] is bound to respect. He may properly make such disclosures as may be necessary to prevent the act or protect those against whom it is threatened."[8]

---

[7] Noldin-Schmitt, *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, 26th ed. (1940), III, n. 672.

The lawyer's fees must be reasonable, according to the standards employed by men of integrity in his profession. A client's ability to pay does not justify an excessive charge. On the other hand, a good Catholic lawyer will reduce his fee in the case of persons of limited resources. Indeed, like every other professional man, the lawyer is obliged in charity to give his services gratuitously to those in need of them, provided he can do so without a relatively grave inconvenience.[9] When he is assigned by the court to defend an impoverished prisoner, he should give his unfortunate individual the same service he would render to a wealthy client. "A lawyer assigned as counsel for an indigent prisoner ought not to ask to be excused for any trivial reason, and should always exert his best efforts in his behalf."[10]

It requires considerable self-sacrifice, and at times heroism, particularly in the materialistic and immoral atmosphere of present-day America, for a Catholic lawyer to be consistent with all that Catholic theology prescribes for men of his profession. But every Catholic lawyer should realize that by conscientiously observing the rules of professional conduct which his religion points out to him he will reflect credit on his Church and will promote the cause of justice and of honesty, which are so necessary for the preservation of our nation.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

*The Catholic University of America,*
*Washington, D. C.*

---

[8] *The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, Year Book, 1941*, p. 162.

[9] Tanquerey, *op. cit.*, III, n. 999.

[10] *The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, Year Book, 1941*, p. 151.

# A SOLDIER'S DEATH, A MARTYRDOM?

It has been claimed repeatedly that the death of a soldier in arms for the defense of a just cause, especially for the outright defense of the true faith, can constitute martyrdom in the proper sense of the word. The claim was made by some in the days of the Crusades; it was made on both sides in World War No. I;[1] and it has been made, at least on our side, in the present war.[2] In view of the hardships that soldiers have to endure at the fronts, nobody would question the use of the word "martyr" in a broad or in a figurative sense, for do we not speak of "martyrs of charity," also of "martyrs of science," even of "martyrs of fashion?" But there are writers who apply to such soldiers the word "martyrs" in its technical, ecclesiastical sense, for they attribute to their death the specific supernatural effects of martyrdom. This article purposes to examine whether this can be done with propriety.

The theology of martyrdom is based upon the assurance of our Lord, "everyone who acknowledges me before men, I also will acknowledge him before my Father in heaven" (Matt. 10:32); "he who loses his life for my sake and for the gospel's sake will save it" (Mark 8:35). This makes one a heroic witness (*μάρτυς; μάρτυρος*) for Christ, or for His cause, and for this very reason likens one most faithfully to Christ sacrificing His life in bearing witness to the faith He had come to give us. Christ Himself assures us that such a heroism is most pleasing to Him; it is to Him the sweetly compelling aroma of the purest love of God: "Greater love than this no one has that one lay down his life for his friends" (John 15:13). Hence also the exceptional merit and reward of martyrdom: in return for being likened to Christ in His death, martyrdom gives one the divine assurance of being likened to Him also in the glory that became His by reason of that death; for a believer in Christ as yet not baptized, such a death even becomes what the Fathers call a baptism of blood, remitting all sin, original as well as personal. "We have, besides, a second laver, . . . of which the Lord says: 'I have a baptism to be baptized with' (Luke 12, 50), when he had already been baptized. . . .This is that baptism which both takes the place of the laver when not received and restores it when lost."[3]

---

[1] Cf. *Pastoralblatt*, Köln, Jhrg. 48 (1914), pp. 258–62.

[2] Cf Bluett, J. Jos., S. J., "Our Soldier Dead: Are They Martyrs?" *America*, (1943), pp. 208 f.

[3] Tertullian, *Liber de Bapt.*, col. 16. (*MPL*, I, col. 1323.)

As to this latter point, St. Augustine wrote: "All who, even though they have not received the laver of regeneration, die in bearing witness for Christ receive through that as much unto forgiveness of sins as they would have received if they had been washed at the sacred font."[4] So sure was St. Augustine of the immediate salvation and of the dignity of a martyr, that he coined the saying which finds expression in the constant practice of the Church: "It is an insult to pray for a martyr, to whose prayers we ought to be commended."[5] With these and similar assurances before them, theologians investigate the concept and the requisites of martyrdom.

Since St. Thomas is usually referred to as theological authority for the claim that soldiers dying in arms whilst defending a just cause can be genuine martyrs, we should weigh carefully just what St. Thomas teaches. He touches upon martyrdom in several of his works. To our point are especially the *Summa*, II–II, q. 124; III, q. 66, a. 12; *Com. in L. Sent.*, IV, d. 49, q. 5. But as to St. Thomas, it is to be kept in mind that his later, maturer works are of greater doctrinal weight than his earlier ones. His *Commentary on the Four Books of Sentences* belongs to the beginning of his career as teacher; his *Summa Theologica* on the other hand is the ripened fruit of his career and has the greater weight.

In his *Com. in L. Sent.*, d. 49, q. 5, a. 3, sol. 2, St. Thomas writes, in answer to the objection: a common good is preferable (*potius*) to a particular good, yet one dying in a war in defense of the commonwealth (a common good) has no aureola coming to him, therefore one who accepts death in order to preserve the faith in himself (a particular good) does also not have the aureola of a martyr coming to him:

> . . .there is to be said that also an uncreated good surpasses all created good; wherefore any created end, whether it be a common good or a private good, cannot impart to an act as much goodness as an uncreated end, namely when something is done on account of God; and therefore, when one undergoes death in behalf of the common good not referred to Christ, he does not merit the aureola and will not be a martyr; but if this be referred to Christ, he will merit the aureola and will be a martyr, if, namely, he defends the commonwealth against the attacks of enemies who endeavor to corrupt the faith of Christ and in such a defense undergoes death.

Yet even here St. Thomas in his answer does not mention expressly a death endured in an armed defense of a Christian commonwealth against the attack of an anti-Christian enemy, that is, in a defense in which force is repelled by force; he could have had in mind the case of a Christian ruler who in peaceful defense of his Christian commonwealth suffers death at the hands of his anti-Christian enemies. It must also not be overlooked that when St. Thomas speaks of a good or virtue as "cause of martyrdom" he excludes a purely natural one: "Not only the confession of the faith, but any other virtue, not social (*non politica*) but infused, that has Christ as end, is sufficient cause of martyrdom."[6] This exclusion is important.

---

[4] *De Civitate Dei*, I, 13, c. 7. (*MPL*, XLI.)

[5] *Sermo ad Populum 119*. (*MPL*, XXXVIII, col. 868.)

In his *Summa*, II–II, q. 124, a. 5, St. Thomas proposes this question for solution: "Whether faith alone is the cause of martyrdom." In accordance with his method he first directs objections against the solution he intends to give. In this case he objects, thirdly, that, if besides the faith other goods were to be considered as cause of martyrdom, then certainly those virtuous deeds would seem to be foremost which are directed toward the common good, and accordingly "it would seem before all that those would be martyrs who die for the defense of their country. Yet this is not consistent with Church observance, for we do not celebrate the martyrdom of those who die in a just war. Therefore faith alone is the cause of martyrdom." In answer to this objection St. Thomas, keen teacher that he is, adheres strictly to the point proposed: the good of one's country, as common good, is indeed foremost among its kind, that is among human [merely natural] goods, but any human good must give preference to a divine good; only this latter can be cause of martyrdom. Only then can a human good become the cause of martyrdom if it takes on—and in so far as it takes on—"the character of a divine good by being referred to God." It will be noticed that here St. Thomas is much more guarded than in his *Commentary on the Sentences.* He justly upholds the statement that not only the faith in general but also any particular virtue and, for that matter, any good even of the natural order if it is referred to God, becomes a divine good and as such can become the cause of martyrdom, but he does not gainsay what in the objection he calls the constant observance of the Church, namely that one who dies fighting in a just war is not to be considered a martyr. All that can be inferred from this answer of St. Thomas is that a good of this kind can become the cause of martyrdom provided the other requisites for martyrdom are at hand, of which anon. He expresses the same thought in II–II, q. 123, a. 5, where he writes that "martyrs are not commended because of warfare (*de rebus bellicis*)" except inasmuch as "they face assaults that are made against their own person, and this for the sake of the sovereign good, which is God"—a warfare evidently quite different from worldly warfare, even though the fortitude that the martyrs have is not "outside the genus of fortitude that regards warlike actions, for which reason they are said to have been *valiant in battle.*"

---

[6] *Com. in L. Sent., loc. cit.,* ad 9.

However, a divine good is not the only requisite for a true martyrdom. From St. Thomas' statements concerning martyrdom the four following requisites, including the one just mentioned, must concur: (1) death must truly ensue; (2) death must be accepted voluntarily, and that means without resistance by physical force; (3) the cause of death must be either the faith of Christ in general or an act of virtue which is recognized as supernaturally related to God and is performed on account of Him; (4) in the event of a personal sin as yet not forgiven and which cannot be confessed, the one who thus suffers death must have at least attrition.

All theologians agree on the necessity of these four requisites. But there are some, such as Silvius, who, in order to save their understanding of St. Thomas in the texts referred to as teaching that soldiers falling in a just war in defense of their country can thereby be martyrs, give quite a singular interpretation to the second requisite; they claim: the fact that the soldiers die fighting does not mean that they do not willingly accept death for their Christian cause, but that they by force resist as long as they can merely to be able to keep on defending the just cause; once mortally wounded, they can willingly surrender their life for what they consider a divine good, and can thus become martyrs in the proper sense of the word. On the other hand the *Salmanticenses* argue very soundly that, except in the case they mention toward the end of their argument, such soldiers are not to be considered martyrs in the proper sense of the word. It is necessary to quote their argument in its entirety:

Against the statement that "the aureola of martyrdom is to be conferred absolutely and simply on those who have endured unto death for the faith of Christ or for some truth by reason of its connection with the faith assailed by men" there are raised two objections. The second of these objections—it is the one to our point—is as follows:

> You will object that from our statement there follows that Christian soldiers who fall in a just war are martyrs in the proper sense of the word, which, however, the observance of the Church does not approve; therefore

etc. The sequel is proved by pointing out that the aforesaid soldiers in reality give their life for justice and for the good of virtue or also for the faith attacked by all; therefore there is no requirement for martyrdom wanting in them.

In answer, I deny the sequel, at least as a universal proposition: first, because even if the war be just, and the cause of common justice—also as far as the dying soldier is concerned—be referred to God, yet the battle does not always concern faith, as is evident when Christian princes war with one another, when neither intends to corrupt the faith, but merely to defend his own commonwealth and common good or to seek amends for evils unjustly inflicted upon him.

And the same is to be said in case the war were against infidels in which Christians were fighting for the propagation of the faith yet where the infidels were to kill Christians not directly out of hatred of the faith or of a virtue, but for some temporal good, or to defend or avenge themselves; for also those dying under these conditions would not be martyrs, since they are not killed just because they are witnesses of the faith. There is no doubt also about these. But if infidels were to make war directly out of hatred of the faith and in order to overthrow it by destroying the Christian commonwealth, in that case there is some difficulty as to whether Christian soldiers who might fall in that war (provided they die in grace) should be called martyrs. St. Thomas, namely, in the II–II, cited, and in the aforementioned IV, quaestiuncula 2, ad 11, suggests an affirmative answer. Reason, too, seems to acquiesce, because such soldiers both by intention and in act die for the faith of Christ, that is attacked by men, and from a most imperative battle bear away a most perfect victory. What, therefore, is wanting to entitle them to receive the aureola?

Yet this notwithstanding, it is the common practice of the Church not to accept such as martyrs. And so it is without doubt to be held, except it be that the aforesaid soldiers, captured by the infidels, be required to deny the faith or to do anything sinful and in the face of that patiently endure unto death in the faith and in justice. The reason [for not accepting such soldiers as martyrs] is because true martyrs must in their sufferings be conformed to Christ, whose witnesses they are; Christ, not conquering by fighting bodily but by suffering patiently—"for he did not vanquish the world by iron but by wood," as St. Augustine says in his comment upon Psalm 54,—and setting an example for imitation of himself through martyrdom, did not counsel an external attack upon the enemy but a humble and patient endurance of death: "By your patience you will win your souls" (Luke 21). Nor does he say, "Blessed are they who resist," but, "who suffer persecution for justice' sake" (Matt. 5); whence St. Paul in his second letter to the Corinthians (10) said: "We do not make war according to the flesh; for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual," because the martyrs of Christ obtain the victory over the world not by material arms or battle, but by the spiritual arms of patience, humility, meekness, etc., according to the text of Matt. 10: "Behold, I am sending you forth like sheep in the midst of wolves. Be therefore wise as serpents, and guileless as doves." This kind of fighting, however, is not the part of secular soldiers, who *per se* primarily intend to kill the enemies with the sword; and though they perhaps may not refuse to lay down their life, they do this *per accidens*, if perchance the outcome of the war goes against them; nor do they then reckon that they have conquered, but rather when they, retaining their own life, have beaten down the enemy.

Add to this that, since martyrdom is the most eminent act of fortitude and since this does not consist in attacking, but in enduring, as St. Thomas shows in II–II, 123, a. 6, only those are absolutely and simply to be called martyrs whose prime intention it is to endure and, enduring unto death, to give testimony that for the faith of Christ they despise all things, their very life itself, whereas the secular soldiers *per se* primarily intend to attack, and only in a measure and *per accidens* do they have to endure; wherefore it is not from this last act—for which the name martyr is employed—but from that first one that they are absolutely to be called secular soldiers.

For the rest, if the aforesaid soldiers, when captured by infidels and tempted either to desert the faith or to give up any other work that, all things being considered, were an act of virtue, as for instance that they do not defend their christian country—which it is their duty to do—or that they to anything against God even venially sinful, rather choose to die bravely than to consent to the evil design of the infidels, and at the same time connect this with a supernatural end, they will truly and properly be martrys and the Church will add them to the list of holy martyrs. *It is along this line that the Angelic Doctor speaks.* [Let us take notice of this sentence. Italics are mine.] —What has just been said also furnishes the refutation of what reason seems to suggest in favor of the opposite opinion, because the most perfect victory over the world is to be gained by the soldiers of Christ not *per se* and primarily by attacking and as it were *per accidens* enduring, but primarily (*prima intentione*) by enduring unto death in the testimony of the faith.[7]

The one possibility of martyrdom, justly reserved for them by the *Salmanticenses*, namely for those who, taken captive, rather endure death at the hands of "the persecutor" of the faith than apostatize or commit even a venial sin, is self-evident; but such men no longer die as secular soldiers, resisting force with force or because they have thus resisted in battle, they now patiently endure death as direct witnesses of the faith. Concrete cases of this kind are mentioned in a letter written by St. Louis, King of France. The letter is dated about the year 1250, that is, about two years before St. Thomas in Paris began his career as commentator on the *Sentences*, which circumstance makes it plausible that, as the *Salmanticenses* claim, St. Thomas in the texts quoted had in mind just such cases. A number of Crusaders, namely, having fought bravely in battle, were taken prisoners by the Mohammedans; as prisoners they chose to submit to torture and death rather than apostatize from the faith. Having recorded their steadfastness in the faith under that ordeal, St. Louis wrote of them: "In lawful conflict they received the crown of martyrdom purpled with blood. Whose blood, as we firmly believe, will cry to the Lord for the Christian people."[8]

---

[7] *Cursus Theol.*, tom. 5, tract. 9, d. 3, dub. 2, nn. 23, 24. (Ed. nova, 1878.)

Pope Benedict XIV wrote an extensive treatise on what constitutes true martyrdom.[9] It goes without saying that what Benedict XIV asserts in this work has the greatest weight in the question of what constitutes true martyrdom, not only because he was an eminent canonist but also for years the *Promotor Fidei* in every cause of beatification and canonization conducted at Rome. In chapter 11, number 1, he has a sentence that contains the definition of martyrdom: ". . . it seems worth while to point out that martyrdom is a voluntary enduring or suffering of death on account of the faith of Christ, or on account of some other virtuous act referred to God." This is quite in harmony with what St. Thomas writes about martyrdom. Continuing, Pope Benedict, again in agreement with St. Thomas, writes that in true martyrdom there are concerned two distinct persons, (1) the persecutor or tyrant, (2) the martyr: "It takes two persons to have martyrdom, that is the persecutor or tyrant, and the martyr; and, of course, the tyrant must be a person distinct from the person of the martyr, since the persecutor or tyrant must inflict the punishment, whereas the martyr must endure it." These two factors he finds indicated in the words with which our Lord foretold martyrdom to St. Peter: "When thou art old thou wilt stretch forth thy hands, and another will gird thee, and lead thee where thou wouldst not. Now this he said to signify by what manner of death he should glorify God" (John 21:18; cf. Matt. 10:17).

(1) As to the persecutor, it is required, (*a*) that he really, directly or indirectly, inflict death, excepting a case such as that of St. John the Evangelist, in which God in a miraculous manner should prevent

---

[8] *Gesta Dei per Francos*, tom. I, p. 2, p. 1199. The letter is quoted by Benedict XIV, *De Servorum Dei Beatificatione et Beatorum Canonizatione*, III, c. 18.

[9] *Ibid.*, cc. 11–19.

death from ensuing upon the deadly action of the persecutor; (*b*) that the persecutor inflict death "out of hatred of the faith, or of something pertaining to the faith."[10]

Pope Benedict devotes chapters 13 and 14 to bringing out very forcefully that, for the Church to consider one a martyr, it must be proved beyond doubt that "the persecutor" in inflicting death upon him was motivated by hatred of the faith. If, for instance, a "tyrant" would put a missionary to death because he thinks that the man is an emissary of a foreign government or the forerunner of foreign merchants who might exploit the land, there could be no question of martyrdom, even though the missionary might subjectively accept death for the faith.

(2) As to the victim, the three following requisites must concur: (*a*) that he accepted death voluntarily; (*b*) that he endured death in witness of the faith; (*c*) that he endured death with proper spiritual disposition. It is beyond the purpose of this article to deal with requisite (*c*) it can here be taken for granted; and requisite (*b*) has been dealt with sufficiently above; Benedict is in perfect agreement with that; but as to requisite (*a*)—voluntary acceptance of death—he is even more specific and brings into the foreground the mind of the Church on this point. Having stated and proved, in connection with the definition, that for true martyrdom there must be "a voluntary acceptance of death" in witness of the faith, he specifies in chapter 18 what is meant by this requirement: he brings up the case of one resisting the attack of the persecutor of the faith and even endeavoring to inflict death upon him, thus to save his own life, but is killed in the endeavor. Is such a one a martyr? After reviewing the various opinions, including those of theologians who try to vindicate the possibility of true martyrdom for a soldier in this contingency, and also after pointing out the universally accepted principle that no one could be a martyr except that in suffering he imitate the exemplar of martyrs,

---

[10] Cf. *Ibid.*, cc. 12–14.—Speaking of the persecutor, some years ago during a visit to the Art Museum in Chicago I was studying a series of paintings representing the life and martyrdom of some saint. The work, done in a period of art when they painted quite realistically, was very good; it had been brought over from some church in Europe of which that saint was the patron. The last piece of the series represented the martyr high up, surrounded by heavenly glory and venerated by prelates, priests, and people assembled in the church below. As I was studying this last piece, some man who had been looking at these pictures said to me: "Tell me, why does the Catholic Church first torture people that way and then make them the object of its cult?" The man was so sincere that he was very grateful for the answer which he received.

Christ, who gave testimony of the truth "not by fighting with weapons or by resisting the tyrant," and after quoting several authorities against conceding martyrdom in such a case, the Pope, the experienced former *Promotor Fidei*, makes this incisive statement:

> If to all this we add that up to now no one has ever been entered in the register of the Holy Martyrs who had resisted and fought back, that he might not die, nor that out of so many thousands of Crusaders, or Soldiers of Jerusalem who, warring against the infidels for the faith, have died in the war, not one has been, or is, honored in the Church with the cult of martyrs, it seems that no clearer argument could be brought forward to demonstrate that resistance of one to die [for the faith] is an obstacle to martyrdom, and that for the true concept of martyrdom acceptance of death may not be of the inevitable sort, but must be wholly voluntary.[11]

Nor was this the observance in the Church merely since the Crusades, as is evident from the experience of Emperor Phocas, recorded by Baronius.[12] Knowing well how the hope of martyrdom made not only men but even women overcome the fear of suffering and of death itself, Phocas, desirous of building up the morale of his dispirited army in its defense against the infidel Persians, urgently requested that the soldiers who would happen to fall in battle be ranked among the martyrs. The patriarch of Constantinople, however, and other bishops of the realm repudiated the suggestion so indignantly, especially on the authority of St. Basil, that the emperor desisted from his request.

We notice that those theologians who speak at all of the possibility of martyrdom for soldiers dying in battle stress the fact that the war must be in defense of a "divine good" which the enemy—"the persecutor"—is endeavoring to overthrow, and that martyrdom cannot be associated with merely a "natural, that is, social (*politica*), virtue" as motive; further, that the mind of the Church as presented by Benedict XIV does not admit the claim to martyrdom for soldiers dying in battle, even if the war is in defense of the faith.

Now the question arises, is the present war really in defense of the faith, or at least of some good of the natural order referred to God as supernaturally revealed?

We are the allies of England and Russia against Germany and Japan. The cunning deceit of Japan has justly aroused our indignation and deserves punishment; but its motives are empire-building statecraft, not the attacking of the faith; nor did we declare war on Japan in defense of the faith. The Nazi ideology is a perversion of ethics and, in its basic principles, opposed to the faith; but Hitler did not start this war for the purpose of eradicating the faith in Russia, England, and the United States; race assertion and expansion and economic aggrandizement were his motives. He does not confront his prisoners with the alternative of apostasy or death. Stalin certainly would be amused at the suggestion that he and his communist army are the *Defensor Fidei* and, possibly, martyrs for the faith. The Atlantic Charter is quite lofty as a document of international relationship based on ethics as applied to international affairs (*virtus politica*); but was there even the slightest hint of relating it to God as known by faith? Moreover, not long after his proclamation Mr. Churchill emphatically declared that preservation of the British Empire was one aim of his efforts. He can be praised for the heroic efforts he has made and is making unto that purpose; but where in Scripture or Tradition is there any evidence that the British Empire is an object of faith, or even remotely related to it, so that soldiers dying in defense of it could merit the crown of martyrdom? This war is the final breakdown of economic and social conditions estranged from the faith, and on that score it could not become a cause of martyrdom. And even if apart from the intentions of the belligerents one could say that on our side the war of itself tends toward the defense of the faith, or simply of the Christian order, we nevertheless are confronted by the stand of the Church, not to consider the death of a soldier in battle martyrdom.

---

[11] *Ibid.*, c. 18, n. 6.

[12] *Annales Ecclesiastici*, Ad An. 610, tom. VIII (Ed.1600), pp. 211 f;

Let us honor and remunerate our soldiers, who in many cases are enduring more than some martyrs have had to endure, and let us award them military decorations, but let us avoid any attempt at building up their morale by a promise not divinely warranted, or to offer their bereaved relatives a false consolation by an unfounded assurance of the glory of martyrdom for their beloved ones who have fallen in battle. Their reward with God will be in proportion to the spiritually motivated faithful fulfillment of their Christian duties, including their duties as soldiers. And as to theology, it should weigh and measure human life under all circumstances according to *the weight and measure of the temple*; any time-serving compromise will eventually spell humiliation, whereas a straightforward statement from the Catholic point of view will at least command respect.

*St. Meinrad's Abbey,*
*St. Meinrad, Indiana.*

ALBERT KLEBER, O.S.B.

# THE TWOFOLD ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH MILITANT

In order to gain anything like an adequate realization of the Catholic Church as an entity of the supernatural order, we must remember that the Church militant has a twofold definition and a twofold origin. According to what is termed its broad definition, the Church militant is the congregation of the faithful, the multitude of those who have professed their acceptance of divine, supernatural, public revelation. Considered from this point of view, the Church militant began to exist in the days of our first parents. According to its stricter definition, the Church militant is the society of those baptized persons who profess the faith of Jesus Christ under the leadership of His vicar on earth, the Roman Pontiff. Taken in the light of this definition, the Church militant originated during the public life of our Blessed Lord, through that process in which He selected His disciples and formed them into a perfect society.

The two definitions of the Church militant and the two explanations of its divine origin are perfectly complementary, and not at all opposed, one to the other. The teaching on the twofold origin of this Church is as old as scholastic ecclesiology itself. During different periods in the history of theology, the stress has been placed, sometimes on one definition and origin, and sometimes on the other. But, there is no possibility of an adequate understanding of the Catholic Church other than in the light of both definitions and both origins.

Until well into the sixteenth century, scholastic theologians were inclined to place more emphasis upon the definition of the Church militant as the congregation of the faithful existent since the beginning of the world than upon the stricter formula. From the time of James Latomus and St. Peter Canisius, however, the stricter type of definition, perfected by St. Robert Bellarmine, came to assume greater importance. Strange to say, long after the type of definition popularized by St. Robert had come into its own, a considerable number of ecclesiologists continued to explain the origin of the Church militant primarily in terms of God's dealings with our first parents. We find this tendency among theologians as comparatively modern as Honoratus Tournely, Peter Collet, and Nicholas Girardeau. The practice of explaining the origin of the Church primarily, or almost exclusively, in the light of the social formation of the disciples by our Lord has been in general vogue only since the beginning of the nineteenth century.

The custom of emphasizing the origin of the Church during the public life of Christ has become so widespread that it is helpful to recall that the doctrine of the twofold origin forms an integral part of scholastic ecclesiology. While some theologians, like Thomas Netter of Walden in the fifteenth century, and James Latomus, Ruard Tapper, Thomas Stapleton, and St. Robert Bellarmine in the sixteenth, dealt almost exclusively with the Church militant of the New Testament, a great number of their confreres stated and developed the teaching on the twofold origin of the Church militant.

Thus the thirteenth century Dominican, Moneta of Cremona, taught that the Church, as defined according to the broad definition, began with Abel, the first just man. The Church militant of the New Testament, on the other hand, "began from the coming of Christ, even before the passion and the resurrection, because, before these events, He gave the Holy Ghost to His disciples." Moneta dated the Church militant from Abel rather than from Adam on the ground that the former was the first to persevere in the state of grace.[1] St. Thomas Aquinas also taught that the Church began from Abel.[2] The fifteenth century Cardinal John de Turrecremata held that the Church militant of the New Testament began with the apostles and the other believers, and that the Church, as such, began with Abel.[3]

On the other hand, John Driedo,[4] Francis Sonnius,[5] Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius,[6] and Nicholas Sander[7] all taught that the Church militant originated in Adam himself. Francis Suarez agreed with them, and added that the Church, as it is now, was brought into being by our Lord. Suarez held that our Lord began to form the Church militant of the New Testament when he started His preaching, but that He did not complete the foundation until immediately before the ascension.[8] Francis Sylvius devoted individual articles to each of these two origins of the Church militant, and followed Suarez in every detail.[9]

---

[1] Cf. *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses Libri Quinque* (Rome, 1743), Lib. V, cap. 2, pp. 408 f.

[2] Cf. *De Symbolo Apostolorum*, in the *Opuscula Omnia*, ed. Mandonnet (Paris, 1927), IV, 380.

[3] Cf. *Summa de Ecclesia* (Venice, 1560), Lib. I, cap. 25, pp. 28ʳ ff.

[4] Cf. *De Ecclesiasticis Scripturis et Dogmatibus* (Louvain, 1530), Lib. IV, cap. 2, pars. 1, p. 504. Driedo believed that the Church of God first became distinct from the church of Satan in Abel and Cain (*ibid.*, p. 509).

[5] Cf. *Demonstrationes Religionis Christianae ex Verbo Dei* (Louvain, 1556), Tract. 8, cap. 2, p. 455.

[6] Cf. *Confessio Catholicae Fidei Christiana*, cap. 22 (In the *Opera Omnia*, Cologne, 1584), Vol. I, p. 30.

[7] Cf. *De Visibili Monarchia Ecclesiae* (Louvain, 1571), Lib. IV, cap. 3, p. 130.

In demonstrating the antiquity of the Church, St. Robert Bellarmine, like Thomas Stapleton, took cognizance only of the institution of this society during the public life of our Lord.[10] St. Robert, however, insisted that the Church had been in existence since the beginning of the world.[11] The same teaching appears in the *Commentaries* of John Wiggers.[12]

Honoratus Tournely's teaching on the origin of the Church deals with its beginning in Abel.[13] Nicholas Girardeau held that the Church militant began with Adam and his family,[14] while Peter Collet contented himself with the assertion that the Church had originated at the beginning of the world.[15] All of these men stressed this aspect of the origin of the Church militant. It was not till the nineteenth century, with the writings of Bruno Liebermann,[16] John Perrone,[17] Albert Knoll,[18] and Patrick Murray,[19] that the origin of the Church militant was explained principally in terms of its foundation during our Lord's life on earth. Archbishop Valentine Zubizarreta, among the contemporary theologians, emulates Sylvius by giving almost equal attention to both origins.[20]

---

[8] Cf. *Opus de Triplici Virtute Theologica* (Lyons, 1621), Tract. I, *De Fide*, Disp. 9, Sectio 2, pp. 162 f.

[9] Cf. *De Praecipuis Fidei Nostrae Orthodoxae Controversiis cum Nostris Haereticis*, Lib. III, q. 3, a. 1-2 (In the *Opera Omnia*, Antwerp, 1698), V, 265 f.

[10] St. Robert Bellarmine, *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei adversus Huius Temporis Haereticos*, Tom. I (Ingolstadt, 1586), *Quartae Controversiae Generalis Liber Quartus*, cap. 5, col. 1341 f.

[11] Cf. *op. cit.*, cap. 6, col. 1348.

[12] Cf. *Commentaria de Virtutibus Theologicis* (Louvain, 1689), p. 117.

[13] Cf. *Praelectiones Theologicae de Ecclesia Christi*, Tom. I (Paris, 1739), pp. 40 ff.

[14] Cf. *Prolegomena seu Praelectiones Theologicae de Religione, de Verbo Dei, seu Scripto, seu Tradito; de Ecclesia, et Conciliis*, Tom. I (Paris, 1743), pp. 470 ff.

[15] Cf. *Institutiones Theologicae*, Tom. II (Paris, 1757), p. 447. Both Girardeau and Collet insist that the Church, considered according to its broad definition, originated at the beginning of the world, while the same society, considered according to its stricter definition, began during the public life of Christ.

[16] Cf. *Institutiones Theologicae*, Tom. II (Brescia, 1831), pp. 56 ff.

[17] Cf. *Praelectiones Theologicae . . . in Compendium Redactae* (Paris, 1861), I, 76 ff.

[18] Cf. *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae Generalis seu Fundamentalis* (Turin, 1868), pp. 351 ff.

[19] Cf. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi* (Dublin, 1860), I, 131 ff.

[20] Cf. *Theologia Dogmatico-Scholastica ad Mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis* (Bilbao, 1937), I, 272 ff.

However, the teaching on the Church militant as a mystery, as a reality of the intrinsically supernatural order, would be utterly incomplete if either origin were neglected. As a distinct religious society, the Church militant was founded by our Lord during the course of His public life. At the same time, however, here and now, the supernatural kingdom of God upon earth, a social reality which has been in existence since the first days of the human race, is this same Catholic Church. No man can begin to appreciate this Church until he realizes that it is, at the same time, the society of Christ's disciples and the kingdom, the city, or the house of God in this world.

### THE KINGDOM OF GOD

The basic concept for the understanding of the twofold origin of the Church militant is the notion of the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God is the realm over which God may be said to rule as Monarch. Thus there is such a thing as a kingdom of God in the purely natural sense, and another domain which constitutes His supernatural kingdom. A great deal of confusion may be avoided through attention to this distinction.

Because all things created are subject to the eternal law and are governed by God, the entire universe can be designated as His kingdom. This kingdom, which is one by reason of the unity of its purpose and government, is purely natural. Creatures, by the very force of their own natures, are necessarily and entirely subject to God's power and His providence. It was in this sense that the Psalmist wrote of God that "he is a great king over all the earth."[21]

At the same time, in a special and supernatural way, God is King over those who accept the law which He gives to men by way of revelation. The law, in the light of which this special kingdom of God is distinguished, comes to men in a supernatural manner. It is given to men as a divine communication. It is not merely a body of truths which men have derived from the consideration of God's works in the world. It is a message, formed by God and delivered to man in such a way that definite statements can be accepted because God has made them, and has deigned to communicate them to His children.

Likewise, this law is intrinsically supernatural. It is embodied in a revelation which is intrinsically supernatural in content, that is, in a communication which involves truths about God as He is known or seen in Himself, and not merely as He is recognized as the First Cause of creatures. As such, this message, and the law which is contained in it, could never be known by any creature through the unaided forces of its own intelligence. The supernatural kingdom of God is defined in function of such a knowledge.

---

[21] *Ps.* 46: 3.

This kingdom is at home, *in patria,* only in the courts of heaven. It began to exist there at the moment that the good angels chose to be faithful to God, and were admitted to the beatific vision. Men entered this kingdom of God in heaven only with our Lord's ascension into heaven.

That kingdom has existed in this world since the days of our first parents. After the fall of Adam, that kingdom was a Church militant, persevering in the faith and service of God only through strenuous efforts against men and forces which would tend to disrupt it. The law, in function of which this kingdom of God on earth is designated, is contained in what we know as divine, supernatural, public, Christian revelation. The faith by which this revelation was accepted has always been, since the fall, a faith at least implicitly Christian, since the doctrine which God revealed to men was principally concerned with Christ, the Redeemer. The men who have signified acceptance of this divine public revelation have constituted the one supernatural kingdom of God upon earth.

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE KINGDOM

From the day when God first gave the promise of redemption to our first parents until our Lord's ascension into heaven, the supernatural kingdom of God in this world increased substantially in perfection along two distinct, yet complementary, lines. There was a substantial increase in the content of that revealed message in which the law of the kingdom was enclosed. Furthermore, at various periods of its history, new conditions of social organization arose within the kingdom of God on earth. The teaching on the development of the Church, an integral part of the literature of scholastic ecclesiology, is based on these two factors.

Many of the scholastic doctors included in their teachings on the Church an account of the various stages through which this organization has passed. There was never, however, any attempt at unanimity in counting or explaining the individual stages of the Church as the kingdom of God on earth. Thus, in one chapter of his *Summa de Ecclesia,* the Cardinal John de Turrecremata offers four distinct lists in which he explained successively, two, four, five, and six divisions of the Church's history. First he taught that the Church could be considered as having a time of youth and a time of old age. Secondly he mentions a period of childhood, that through which the Church passed in the time of Abel, the prophets and the patriarchs; a time of youth, when martyrs were abundant; a period of old age, during which the faith of Christ is being spread abroad throughout the world; and finally a period of extreme old age, the stage in which the Church will be found at the end of the world.

Turrecremata took our Lord's parable of the workers in the vineyard as the basis for his third division of the stages of the Church as the kingdom of God on earth. According to this explanation, the morning of the Church was the time from Adam to Noe. The third hour was the period between Noe and Abraham. The sixth hour extended until the age of Moses, and the ninth until the time of Christ. The interval between the advent of our Lord and the end of the world corresponds to the eleventh hour.

Turrecremata's final arrangement of the ages of the Church is taken from St. Augustine. According to this division, the history of the Church militant is separated into six sections; 1) from Adam to Noe, 2) to Abraham, 3) to David, 4) to the Exile, 5) to the coming of Christ, 6) until the end of the world.[22] John Driedo spoke of eight divisions; 1) from Adam to Abraham, 2) to Moses, 3) to Saul, 4) to the death of Solomon, 5) to the Captivity, 6) to the end of the Macchabean rule, 7) to the Ascension, 8) until the end of the world.[23] Francis Sonnius used Driedo's system.[24]

Throughout these varied attempts to explain the history of God's kingdom on earth, three substantially different conditions of this kingdom are apparent. From the days of our first parents until the granting of the Mosaic covenant those who composed the kingdom, and who thus could be designated in a special and supernatural way as the people of God, were not gathered into any universal religious or secular society. After the Mosaic dispensation, one nation was selected by God Himself as His chosen people. This nation lived according to a civil and religious constitution revealed by God. The corporate worship of God's kingdom on earth was perfected and accomplished within the confines of that society. As time went on the civil unity of that people disappeared. One of the two kingdoms into which the Israelitic commonwealth had split ceased to exist as a state. However the religious society of the Israelitic nation continued to exist and to act as the kingdom or the city of God in this world. In a distinct manner, God was the King and the Protector of that society.

---

[22] Cf. *op. cit.*, Lib. I, cap. 22, pp. 25$^r$ ff.

[23] Cf. *op. cit.*, Lib. IV, cap. 2, pars 1, pp. 509 f.

[24] Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 455 f.

The last and absolutely definitive stage of the kingdom of God on earth began with our Lord's organization of His disciples into a visible religious society. St. Peter's words, recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, make it clear that a considerable number of men besides the Twelve were continually in the company of Jesus "Beginning from the baptism of John until the day wherein he was taken up from us."[25] Only a definitely limited number, invited by our Lord Himself, were privileged to enter this group during the course of His public life. The Gerasene, out of whom Christ cast the legion of devils, wished to enter this company. Our Lord would not allow this man to follow Him but instead commissioned him to do another work.[26] Manifestly the inhabitants of the Samaritan village who believed in Christ did not remain in His company during His activity in Judea and Galilee.[27] The disciples, then, were the men and women who actually followed Christ. They were the group who were gathered together in the upper room after He had gone up into heaven. They certainly constituted a distinct religious group within the Israelitic society from the very moment of their organization. During the public lifetime of our Lord, there were men and women who accepted His teaching, but who were not numbered in the society of His disciples.

This society of the disciples was perfected during the entire period of our Lord's public life. From the very beginning of His preaching work, these disciples appeared as an organized social unit. The Pharisees noticed them as a distinct group.[28] They were in the company of Christ. He chose one of them, and promised this man the position of leader, in such a way that this disciple was to direct the rest of the organization in the name and by the authority of Christ. He gave a definite jurisdiction within this society to twelve of its members, the apostolic college, which was itself under the leadership of Peter. He described what was to be the corporate act of worship within this society of the disciples, and then, the night before He died, He instituted this new and eternal sacrifice. After He had risen from the dead, our Lord actually gave to Peter and to the others of the apostolic college the power which he had previously promised to them.

---

[25] *Acts* 1: 22.

[26] Cf. *Luke* 8: 38–39; *Mark* 5: 18–19.

[27] Cf. *John* 4:41.

[28] Cf. *Matt.* 9:11; *Mark* 2:18, etc.

Our Lord commissioned and established this society of the disciples as the definitive organization of God's kingdom on earth. As a social unit, the Jewish religious commonwealth rejected our Lord, and thus lost the divine faith, through the possession of which it had functioned as God's kingdom. The society of Christ's disciples, first organized within the framework of this Jewish religious community, remained faithful. Our Lord commanded the members of that society to go into the world and preach His doctrine. The disciples were ordered to baptize, and thus to enroll within their own social group the persons who were willing to believe His message. Christ made it perfectly clear that salvation, the inclusion within the kingdom of heaven *in patria*, was dependent upon the reception of His teaching.

During the public life of Christ it was perfectly possible to be a believer in our Lord, and at the same time to remain outside the society of His disciples. He did not wish to have this condition continue after the ascension. After that event, by His command, those who had believed in His message during the course of His earthly life were to enter the society of the disciples, if they wished to continue in their status as believers. The Samaritans and the Gerasene, who previously had not been invited into the ranks of this society, now were commanded to enter if they wished to be followers of our Lord.

In so far as it had been organized in the light of divine teaching, and in so far as the corporate worship of the true God was conducted within it, the Israelitic religious commonwealth had been, in a special and supernatural sense, the kingdom of God on earth. Nevertheless, this society had never been absolutely co-extensive with the people or the city of God. There had been men like Job, numbered among the citizens of God's kingdom upon earth, accepting and professing the divinely revealed teaching, and yet in no way called to membership in the Israelitic community. The society of the disciples of Christ, which is the Catholic Church, is the kingdom of God in a very different and more perfect sense. The grace by which God calls a man to live according to His supernatural law has been, and will be until the end of time, a force which tends to bring or to keep men within the social unity of this Church. All men are called to the divine life of grace. All men likewise, and by the same vocation, are called to live as members of this, the kingdom of God on earth in its definitive status.

### THE TRUE ISRAEL

"Spiritually we are all Semites," said that grand old man of the twentieth century, Pope Pius XI. In that statement the great pontiff asserted one of the most important truths about the Catholic Church. For, as the kingdom of God on earth, this society is not only the successor, but the continuation of the Israelitic religious commonwealth. As a society, the Catholic Church is of course quite distinct from the Jewish religious organization. The Church was organized however, within the framework of the Jewish commonwealth. Its original members, the disciples who actually followed our Lord during the course of His public life, were members of the society which, at that moment, was the kingdom of God on earth. When that national religious society turned away from the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and when the covenant with the nation as such was abrogated, these original disciples continued as the members of God's kingdom in this world. The transitory and imperfect social organization of the kingdom had given way to its ultimate formation in this world. The corporate worship of God found its expression, not in the impermanent rites of the Aaronitic priesthood, but in the new and eternal sacrifice of the Mass. The supreme visible direction of the kingdom was no longer lodged in the High Priest and in the Sanhedrin, but in Peter, with his fellow members of the apostolic college under him.

But the kingdom remained. Our Lord had been explicit in His insistence that the members of this new organization of the kingdom would be socially united to the saintly patriarchs who had contributed to the founding of the old regime, even while those who were physically the descendants of these same patriarchs would be refused this social communication if they rejected the divine faith.

> And I say to you that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven:
>
> But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into the exterior darkness.[29]

The disciples, organized as they were into a social unity, remained the Israel of God. Furthermore, according to the will of God, the status of the kingdom or the city of God in this new Israel received its definitive form. Henceforth, men were to be numbered as members of the kingdom on earth, not by the circumstance of birth or by incorporation into a political organization, but rather through entrance into a universal society, a social unit into which all the men in this world without exception are invited by God Himself.

---

[29] *Matt.* 8:11–12.

While the Catholic Church is actually the true Israel, the continuation of the kingdom or the city of God which formerly existed in the Jewish religious commonwealth, its status, in some ways at least, differs sharply from that of the older religious society. The kingdom of God under the new dispensation differs from that which existed under the Mosaic covenant primarily in the line of perfection. The Eucharistic sacrifice, the center of its sacramental system and the ultimate expression of its corporate worship, has an efficacy far superior to that of the rites enjoined under the old law. Furthermore, the Catholic Church is co-extensive with the kingdom, according to the new covenant. Whereas, in the time of the older dispensation, a man might belong to the kingdom of God without being called to membership in the Hebrew religious society, under the new covenant no man lives according to the divine supernatural law and possesses the gift of habitual grace without at least intending to enter the fellowship of the Church. Finally, while the very revelation of the Old Testament asserted the essentially transitory character of the kingdom in the Israelitic commonwealth, the Catholic Church is presented by God Himself as the society which will exist as His kingdom until the end of time.

On the other hand there are definite points of resemblance. Under the old law, the true Israelite was called upon to love his nation, and to love the Holy City, Jerusalem. In New Testament times the man who is privileged with membership in the kingdom of God is called upon to manifest an even more intense affection for the Catholic Church. In loving the Church, the Catholic follows the example of our divine Lord. The command to love the Church involves an order to bear a particular affection and regard for our fellow Catholics. The deep and abiding loyalty of the ancient Israelite for his kingdom and his holy city can and should serve as a model for the Christian who seeks to obey the divine command to love the Catholic Church.

## THE LOVE OF THE KINGDOM

Very recently our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, in his encyclical, *Mystici Corporis*, was obliged to remind the Catholics of our day of the existence and the importance of this obligation.[30] No man who is at all familiar with a certain tendency in modern Catholic writing could question the necessity of the Holy Father's reminder. Far too many Catholic publicists, undoubtedly well-meaning, look with favor upon what one of them, Mr. Edward Watkin, naively calls "this healthy Catholic anti-clericalism."[31] What is intended to be a manifestation of love for the Catholic Church through literary effort exercised in her behalf, turns out to be, in the last analysis, an attempt to induce in lay Catholics an attitude of diffidence towards their spiritual leaders. "This healthy Catholic anti-clericalism," admired and expressed by Watkin and a few similar writers, tends to counteract the effect of Christ's prayer "That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."[32] It would substitute for this manifest unity within the Church the emergence of two separate and mutually distrustful camps.

The same tendency against a genuine love for the Church as the kingdom of God on earth is apparent in some Catholic writers' attitudes toward their fellow members of Christ's Mystical Body. The characteristic love of the ancient Israelite for his own people and his own city might well serve as a model for the "liberal" Catholic writer who rushes with pathetic eagerness to blame his coreligionists for every economic and social disturbance, to bow down reverently before arrogant enemies of the Catholic faith, and to discredit the men who defended his own Church since the time of the Reformation.

### A FUNDAMENTAL MISCONCEPTION

These tendencies proceed, more or less consciously, from a fundamental misconception of the Church's function as the kingdom of God on earth. Mr. Edward Watkin, an exceptionally able writer who is by no means guilty of all the aberrations which proceed from this misconception, has managed to express it more effectively than any of his colleagues. According to Mr. Watkin, the loyal Catholic is supposed to give his primary ecclesiastical affection to an invisible Church, which is the communion of all souls in a state of grace.[33]

---

[30] In Father Bluett's edition of the *Mystici Corporis* (New York: The America Press, 1943), pp. 39 ff.

[31] *The Catholic Centre* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1943), p. 148.

[32] *John* 17:21.

[33] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 139.

"Preference of external membership of Christ's visible body to the interior incorporation effected by partaking of His Spirit through grace and charity"[34] is a manifestation of "ecclesiastical materialism."

Thus according to Mr. Watkin, and the less gifted writers who agree with him, the "body of the Church—the visible Church Catholic and Roman" is supposed merely to "embody" the invisible Church, "the communion of all souls in a state of grace."[35] So it is that from the very outset, according to Mr. Watkin's position, the visible Roman Catholic Church finds herself in the unenviable position in which a good man will have always to prefer another religious society to her. If a man fails to prefer the invisible society to the visible, he becomes guilty of the heinous crime of "ecclesiastical materialism."[36] The visible kingdom of God in the New Testament becomes, for these "liberal" writers, the archtype of a supernatural "less favored nation."

It would be bad enough if the society to which the Catholic Church is subordinated were an existent reality. It is much more distressing to see the kingdom of God on earth rejected in favor of a chimaera. There is, of course, no such thing now as an "invisible Church" in this world. The only society in which there is fellowship of grace is, by the disposition of divine providence, the visible association of Christ's disciples, which we know as the Catholic Church.

The assertion that there is such a thing as a soul of the Church, an invisible Church of the men and women in the state of grace in this world, in some way distinct from and more extensive than the visible Church founded by Christ, is the result of a sad misinterpretation of St. Robert Bellarmine's teaching.[37] The error itself is lamentable enough. It becomes intolerable once it entices men of good will to withdraw their primary social religious allegiance from the visible Church of Jesus Christ and give it to this mere figment of the imagination.

If the delusion that a Christian's loyalty to God's kingdom on earth is due primarily to some invisible Church rather than to the visible society established and commissioned by our Lord is allowed to go unchecked, it may nullify or vitiate a great deal of the work which is being done in and for the Catholic Church. It is a dangerous error, perhaps the most specious and at least potentially the most influential for evil in our times. It must not be permitted to continue unchallenged.

---

[34] *Op. cit.*, p. 144ⁿ.

[35] Mr. Watkin describes the body of the Church thus in his essay "The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ," in the symposium *God and the Supernatural*, edited by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1920), p. 263. The teaching that the "invisible Church" is supposed to be "embodied" in this society is found in *The Catholic Centre*, p. 141.

[36] Cf. *The Catholic Centre*, pp. 139 ff.

[37] Cf. "Scholastic Definitions of the Catholic Church," in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXI, 3 (Sept. 1944), p. 222.

The *Mystici Corporis*, with its bold assertion of the Church's visibility,[38] and its castigation of "the pernicious error of those who conjure up from their fancies an imaginary Church, a kind of society that finds its origin and growth in charity, to which they somewhat contemptuously oppose another, which they call juridical,"[39] is the great and necessary first step towards the abolition of this misconception. The theology of the *Mystici Corporis*, the true doctrine of the Mystical Body, must be continually developed. The Holy Father's encyclical is, in the main, an official statement of the ecclesiological teachings of St. Robert Bellarmine. The doctrine of this great Doctor of the Church, especially in the field of ecclesiology, must be studied ever more carefully.

If men can learn the truth about the Catholic Church as the kingdom of God on earth through a consideration of the doctrine of the Mystical Body, they can profit from the true doctrine alone. It is important to note that not all of the teaching which went abroad under the name of the theology of the Mystical Body of Christ was accurate and acceptable. A few years ago there were a great many writers who rejoiced in the fact that, after years of less perfect teaching "The Church herself, too long envisaged solely or primarily in her external aspect, is now presented from within, in her interior nature as Christ's Mystical Body, a fundamental doctrine resuscitated in our day from practical oblivion (the Catholic Encyclopaedia, published in 1911 has only a couple of inches on it), and indispensable to an organic view of the Catholic religion."[40] Mr. Watkin, the writer of these lines, himself had written a treatise entitled "The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ." It must be supposed that the doctrine rescued "from practical oblivion" was the teaching contained in his own treatise. Yet this treatise urges and expounds "the distinction between the soul of the Church—the invisible Church-body of all souls who share in the supernatural life—and the body of the Church—the visible

---

[38] Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 9 ff., 29 ff.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[40] *The Catholic Centre*, p. 64.

Church Catholic and Roman."[41] That distinction is the very thing which the true theology of the Mystical Body, expressed in the *Mystici Corporis* and in the *De Ecclesia Militante* of St. Robert Bellarmine, brands as unfounded. The "resuscitated" doctrine of the Mystical Body will be of little help in bringing men to appreciate the Catholic Church as God's kingdom on earth.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON.

*The Catholic University of America,*
*Washington, D. C.*

[41] *God and the Supernatural,* p. 263.

---

A REMINDER: MISSION SUNDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1944

---

# Answers to Questions

---

## THE MORALITY OF THE OUIJA BOARD

*Question:* What should priests tell Catholics about the use of the ouija board, a practice that is now becoming quite common?

*Answer:* In times of danger and uncertainty, like the present, when people are anxious and fearful about the safety and the whereabouts of service men who are dear to them, there is a tendency to seek information that is unobtainable through ordinary channels from such sources as fortune-tellers, crystal gazers, etc. Recourse to the ouija board—a device that spells out answers under the pressure of the fingers—is one form of this tendency.

Regarding the use of the ouija board two facts can safely be asserted. First, many of the answers obtained by this means are merely manifestations of the unconscious thoughts and desires of the operator. Sometimes it happens, by an extraordinary coincidence, that answers procured in this fashion convey information that seems to be entirely beyond the scope of the natural. Yet, in fact, they are governed by the natural laws of human intellection and volition.

Secondly, it can also be unhesitatingly asserted that the powers of darkness, ever alert to ensnare the souls of men, sometimes intervene in the use of the ouija board and provide knowledge that could not be obtained by any human means. And since there is always a probability that this will take place, one who uses the ouija board for the purpose of getting information not available in the ordinary way is guilty of the grave sin of divination. For, he is invoking, at least implicitly and conditionally, the assistance of the devil.

Accordingly, a priest need have no hesitation in telling the faithful that the use of the ouija board, like recourse to fortune tellers, is objectively a mortal sin. There is no reason for mitigating this statement so far as to say that the *frequent* use of the ouija board is gravely sinful. For, even a single experiment with this dangerous toy may invite the co-operation of the evil spirit; hence, it constitutes a grave violation of the first commandment of God. It might be alleged that the sin of divination would not be committed by one who would expressly reject all communication with the devil and protest that his only purpose is to utilize natural, though latent, human powers. Whatever may be said of the value of this defence in theory, it has very little weight in practice. For it would rarely happen that a person, eagerly using the board to acquire knowledge which he cannot obtain in ordinary ways, would intend efficaciously to exclude information which might be available through diabolical intervention, even though he would make an express statement to the contrary.

## THE CATHOLIC TEACHING ON DIVORCE

*Question:* Are priests justified in preaching that under no circumstances is divorce ever permitted according to Catholic principles?

*Answer:* Such a statement is indeed often made in sermons and instructions; but it should not be expressed in this absolute and unqualified form. In the first place, the Church authorities sometimes allow a Catholic to procure a civil divorce, without any idea of remarrying, in order to be protected against molestation from his or her spouse, or to be assured of alimony, etc. Again, in certain circumstances a divorce in the full sense of the term—that is, the dissolution of a valid marriage with the right to remarry—can be sanctioned or granted by the Catholic Church. Thus, a divorce of this type takes place when the Pauline privilege is granted, or when the Church dissolves a *matrimonium ratum non consummatum* or a marriage contracted by a baptized non-Catholic and an unbaptized person (the so-called "Helena case"). To state the teaching of the Church exactly on this point, it would be advisable for preachers to present the matter somewhat in this way: "The Catholic Church never permits a divorce with the right to remarry in the case of a baptized couple who have been validly married and have lived together as husband and wife." (Cf. Canon 1118.)

## DANGERS TO THE FAITH

*Question 1:* Some Catholic parents in this town recently allowed their children to sing at a concert, the purpose of which was to raise funds for the building of a new Protestant church. Could this be justified?

*Question 2:* What should be said to a Catholic girl who brings her non-Catholic fiancé to Mass every Sunday, and then attends Protestant services with him?

*Answer 1:* The participation of Catholic children in a concert to procure funds for a Protestant church is equivalent to the contributing of money by them for this purpose. Now, to contribute money toward the erection of a Protestant church is proximate material co-operation in false worship, which can be justified only for very grave reasons. In 1822 a decree of the Sacred Penitentiary allowed Catholics to contribute funds toward the erection of a non-Catholic church in a particular locality where Protestants were permitted by civil law to use the Catholic church for their services (Cf. Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia Moralis*, 10th ed. [1919], I, n. 407). The grave reason justifying contributions in this instance was the liberation of Catholics from the obnoxious condition of having their church available to heretics. Some theologians teach that even the avoidance of a very grave personal inconvenience would justify such contributing—for example, if a Catholic storekeeper in a predominantly non-Catholic town would be boycotted and financially ruined in the event that he would not give something toward the building of a Protestant church (Cf. Noldin, *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, II, n. 122). But, apart from such extraordinary circumstances it would be forbidden to Catholics to contribute money or its equivalent (e.g. participation in the aforesaid entertainment) toward the erection of a non-Catholic house of worship. It could hardly ever happen that conditions would be realized which would permit children to take part in a concert for this purpose. Certainly, the mere fact that the parents wish to remain on good terms with their non-Catholic neighbors would not be a sufficient reason. Furthermore, the children might be placed in circumstances that would endanger their Catholic faith, such as attempts at proselytizing on the part of zealous non-Catholics whom they would meet at rehearsals. Above all, they might become imbued with the principle, so widespread in our land today, that all religions are equally good. All things considered, it seems safe to say that practically always the participation of children in a concert such as that described by the questioner would be sinful co-operation toward false worship.

*Answer 2:* The Catholic girl in question should be told that she may not continue her practice of regularly attending non-Catholic services on Sundays, even though she first assists at Mass, and even though her refusal may mean the breaking off of her engagement with the non-Catholic young man. The conditions for allowing passive attendance at a non-Catholic public service, as they are interpreted by theologians and canonists (Canon 1258, §2) certainly do not extend to the case of a private individual who puts the true religion on an equal basis with a false religion and whose regular attendance at false worship is directed merely to personal benefit. Moreover, it this case the danger of perversion and of scandal can hardly be absent. The most practical course for the young woman would seem to be to request a release from her present engagement and to wait for a proposal of marriage from a good Catholic boy.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

## PRIEST AS STATE OFFICIAL IN MARRIAGES

*Question:* In a state in which only ministers of religion are authorized by law to assist at marriages two non-Catholics present themselves to a priest asking him to assist at their marriage. It is asked whether the priest can assist at their marriage. It is suggested that there may be some difference in the decision if both parties are unbaptized, or if, whether baptized or unbaptized, they are unable to find within thirty days a non-Catholic minister who can marry them. In any event, the question arises: When can a Catholic priest act as a state official in marriage?

*Answer:* It seems that no better answer could be given to this question than the private response of the Holy Office given July 25, 1917, which is reported in *Sylloge*, n. 60, and in Bouscaren, *The Canon Law Digest*, vol. II, under canon 1097. The response states that it is settled law that clerics may not without an Apostolic Indult accept public offices which involve the exercise of lay jurisdiction or administration (can. 139,§2); and therefore may not act as civil magistrates in marriage. Even when an Apostolic Indult has been obtained permitting them to exercise the said office, since their official assistance renders the marriages valid in the eyes of the civil law, it is certain that their assistance at the marriages of heretics and infidels is, generally speaking, still illicit if there happens to exist a diriment impediment of the natural or positive divine law against the particular marriage in question, and also in case of scandal. If, therefore, considerations of the public welfare make it advisable to grant such an Apostolic Indult to missionaries, there is no objection to its being granted by the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda to those Vicars Apostolic who ask for it, provided however: 1) That there is no diriment impediment of natural or divine law to the marriage; 2) That no condition is agreed to, contrary to the substance of marriage; 3) That no heretical or superstitious ceremony is connected with the civil act; 4) Finally, that there is no scandal, nor danger of favoring religious indifferentism.

This response was given again on May 31, 1922, and on June 23,1938.

In both of these cases the question arose in countries under the jurisdiction of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, from which circumstance it appears that the question is a live one in such territories, whereas it is considered that in countries under the common law of the Church, such as ours, the rule expressed in canon 139,§2 is to be observed unless the Apostolic Indult mentioned therein is obtained, i.e. that a priest may not act as a civil magistrate in marriages.

There is no mention in the response of the case in which both of the parties are unbaptized, nor is there mention of the impossibility of their approaching a non-Catholic minister within thirty days. It would seem, from the general nature of the prohibition in canon 139,§2, that these exceptions are not ground for permitting a priest to act without the aforesaid Indult. The idea that thirty days may create an exception seems to arise from the provision for marriage in the presence of witnesses alone when the pastor or the Ordinary or a priest delegated by either cannot be present or cannot be approached without serious difficulty and this condition, it is foreseen, will last for a month (can. 1098,1°). It does not, however, seem that this exception applies to relax canon 139,§2 in the present case, for this exception regards those who are bound to the Catholic form of marriage, as the non-Catholics in question are not, and it provides for a marriage which shall be valid even though the priest is not present whereas the case presented contemplates the presence of the priest.

From the foregoing it seems necessary to conclude that without an Apostolic Indult a priest cannot act as a civil magistrate in marriages, as he would be doing in the case presented.

As for the matter of the assistance of the priest at Catholic marriages, he does this in a twofold capacity. As far as the Church is concerned if he is a pastor or a delegate of the pastor acting within his own territory and under no constraint he assists validly at marriages celebrated within that territory. If the parties are subject to him he acts licitly, as also he does if he has permission from the pastor or Ordinary to whom they are subject. Supposing, then, that there is no diriment impediment which would make the marriage invalid on the part of the contracting parties, they are validly married when they contract in the presence of such a pastor or his delegate who is acting validly in assisting at the marriage.

As far as the State is concerned, since it, too, is interested in knowing which of its citizens are validly married in the event of disputes concerning inheritance of property and liability on contracts or torts, it has provided that marriages shall be solemnized in the presence of a minister and duly recorded. Thus it is that the State constitutes ministers of religion its officials for the purpose of assisting at marriages, since its citizens would normally go to them for a church wedding, the most common form of solemnization of marriage. If it has not provided for other officials to have the power to assist at marriages it is obvious that those who wish to obtain the benefits accruing from the recognition of their marriage as valid, and to avoid the penalties which might be incurred if they were to co-habit without having their marriage so recognized, are constrained to present themselves to a minister of religion for the purpose of having their marriage so recognized.

Thus it is that the priest who assists at the marriage of two Catholics or at a mixed marriage in which one of the parties is a Catholic is really, in the eyes of the two laws, Canon and civil, acting in a twofold capacity, i.e. as a priest and as an official of the State. Catholics can, therefore, contract marriage according to the form required by the Church secure in the knowledge that their marriage will also be recognized by the State as valid. The priest, however, who would assist at the marriage of two non-Catholics would act not as a priest but merely as a civil official under the broad designation "minister of religion," and this, according to canon 139,§2, he may not do without an Apostolic Indult. As far as the State is concerned such a marriage would be valid, and since the parties are not bound to the Catholic form, it will be valid in the case of two unbaptized persons because it is according to the law of the State and in the case of two baptized non-Catholics it will probably be valid also; but on the part of the priest assisting it will not be licit unless he has the Apostolic Indult mentioned above.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

## MONSIGNORI IN PROCESSIONS

*Question 1*: May a domestic prelate have a priest as chaplain, or attendant in a procession? If not, should he walk with another Monsignor, or remain alone if no other of the same rank is present?

*Question 2*: Does a Vicar General, who is also a domestic prelate, take precedence over a mitered Abbot in processions and in incensation?

*Answer 1:* A domestic prelate has no right to the attendance of chaplains in processions or at liturgical functions. Strictly speaking, this mark of distinction is proper only for the Ordinary and dignitaries like the Apostolic Delegate in the territory to which he is accredited and Metropolitans within their own provinces. Custom, however, in this country, sanctions the assignment of two clerics to attend any Bishop in procession. *De jure*, however, the only instance in which an extern Bishop would be entitled to a chaplain would be where he takes part in cope and mitre in a procession, in which case the attendant (and there should be but one) walks with the Bishop to carry his mitre when he is not wearing it.

*Answer 2:* Canon 370, §1, of the *Codex Juris*, provides that the Vicar General, in his own territory, has precedence over all members of the clergy of the diocese, of whatever dignity, except those who are Bishops. The *Caeremoniale Episcoprum* (I, xiii, 12) leaves the precedence of Vicars General to local custom but places even Protonotaries Apostolic *ad instar* after Abbots. Hence, we should conclude that a mitered Abbot should take precedence over the Vicar General in processions and in incensation.

## THE DOUBLE RING CEREMONY

*Question:* Is the "double ring" ring ceremony permitted? If so, is the prayer for the blessing of the ring, as found in the Ritual, said in the plural number, and do groom and bride succesively place a blessed ring each on the finger of the other, saying the accustomed words, "With this ring, etc."?

*Answer:* The Ritual provides for only one ring in the marriage ceremony, that which the groom places on the finger of the bride. However, since according to Title VII, Chapter 3, note 6, of the Ritual, laudable customs may be followed in the wedding rite in addition to the ceremonies prescribed, there may be a second ring provided to be placed on the finger of the groom. As the double-ring ceremony is matter of custom and not of legislation, it is custom which will govern the manner in which it is to be carried out. Our understanding is that the ring for the groom is not usually blessed but only that for the bride, as in the Ritual. After the bride's ring has been placed on her finger, the bride places the groom's ring on his, each saying in turn the form: "With this ring I thee wed, etc."

WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

# Book Reviews

---

The Problem of Pain. By C. S. Lewis. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1944. Pp. viii + 145. $1.50.

This treatise on the problem of suffering, written by the justly celebrated author of the *Screwtape Letters*, is packed with deep thought and characterized by refreshing originality of treatment and expression. The author apparently has read and absorbed the best divines of his communion but is not equally familiar with the great exponents of Catholic teaching on the subject. It is not surprising, then, that he lapses into error occasionally, despite his undoubted good will and mental acumen. The educated Catholic who can recognize and sift out the author's errors will derive much profit and stimulation from this book. Obviously, however, it cannot be recommended to all the faithful indiscriminately.

The book is a well co-ordinated logical unit. The opening chapters (II, III) are designed to show that the presence of pain in the world does not militate against the omnipotence and goodness of God. The nature of God's love towards us is explained with considerable clarity and force: the conclusion is drawn that God desires us to suffer that we may be perfected and thus become more worthy of His love. This naturally brings up the question why we need improvement. The author replies that this is due to our sinfulness (Chap. IV). The discussion of our guilt and of the necessity of repentance is especially timely and impressive. But how did we become so sinful? The question is answered in the fifth chapter, which is devoted to the Fall of Man. It contains much that is excellent, but in some respects it is the weakest in the book. The notions of the author about the elevation of man to a higher state, and of original sin, are hazy and unsatisfactory. The concept of the supernatural has eluded him altogether. The sixth chapter discusses some further advantages of suffering: it helps us to surrender our wills completely to God by shattering various illusions which we entertain concerning ourselves. The following chapter (VII) contains some noteworthy observations on a number of difficulties arising from human suffering.

What is the consequence of an obstinate refusal to surrender one's will to God? The author responds that this is the punishment of Hell (Chap. VIII). He solves some of the more important objections brought against this doctrine very effectively, but he interprets the fire of Hell figuratively and he is bemused in his explanation of the eternity of the state of damnation.

The ninth chapter considers the problem of animal pain. The intrinsic evil of the animal world is thought to lie in the fact that animals live by destroying each other. The author believes that this evil was introduced into the animal world by Satanic agency long before the creation of man. He shows conclusively that animals which have no consciousness of self cannot properly feel pain. On the other hand, he thinks that some of the higher animals, especially those of the domestic variety, may have this consciousness of selfhood in a rudimentary way. He suggests that these animals may attain immortality in man, i.e., on account of their intimate association with man, with whom they are thought to form a kind of body analogous to the Mystic Body. The concluding chapter deals with heaven, with which the sufferings of the present time cannot be compared. Its happiness will consist in the fact that "each of the redeemed shall forever know and praise some one aspect of the divine beauty better than any other creature can."

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

LATIN GRAMMAR. Grammar, Vocabularies, and Exercises in Preparation for the Reading of the Missal and Breviary. By Cora Carroll Scanlon, A.M., and Charles L. Scanlon, A.M. St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1944 Pp. ix + 334. $3.00.

The first lines of the preface announce that "this Latin grammar is intended *for students who are entering seminaries or religious novitiates without previous study of Latin*" (italics mine). Here there is a matter-of-fact assumption—by lay persons—concerning the fate and status of Latin among some of us, in the face of which it is quite useless and foolish to inquire with startled tones, "Has it actually come to this?" Rather, the authors should perhaps receive credit for making a correct observation and stating it to us—*vel in talari vel in habitu*—publicly. Whether they offer an instrument to meet satisfactorily an exigency and a concession that we hope will not obtain much longer, is another matter.

The grammar addresses itself also to Sisters who recite the breviary and to lay people who use the missal and breviary. In twenty lessons, divided into fifty units, the essentials of grammar are covered and put into practice through Latin texts served by 914 words, the vocabulary found in the Ordinary of the Mass and the three Requiem Masses, with the special Collects. There are extra reading lessons taken from the Vulgate. Modern devices, such as the study of Latin-English cognates and true-false exercises, are also employed.

Given a good teacher, who will explain with greater lucidity the grammar offered and in many instances amplify the grammar essentials, this book may be used with some success. Such a teacher will also assist his students over the ill-devised and doubtful Latin of some of the invented sentence materials. He will have to give some very special assistance, too, in the reading of the selections from the Vulgate. Furthermore, it will be necessary for him to comb numerous mistakes out of the Latin text. Note, for example, these corrigenda on p. 122: veniam delictorum suorum *petiebant;* tam bonus erat ut *largiret* pauperibus; se aestimabant *digni;* quaedam vota . . . *facenda* sunt; *pani* manducato, discipuli vinum biberunt. This may be the worst page, but an entire Latin grammar should not total so many blunders.

However, a real contribution of this book is its Latin-English vocabulary (pp. 199–334), containing all the words of both the Roman missal and the Roman breviary. There are some eight thousand entries. It is suggested that this section be gone over once more, particularly for accent mistakes (there are more than sixty; e.g., under the letter "C": *circumfúlgere*, *citháraedus*, *commíscere*, *compéditus*, *congéner*, *crastínus*, *cúbile*, *cúpido*, *cúrrilis*), and published separately for our priests. Not all of them have assimilated vocables such as: *dietim*, *ferculum*, *humicubatio*, *morticina*, *paxillus*, *pincerna*, *procus*, *trabea*, *Ulyssipo* (and there are hundreds like these); and not all priests have Latin dictionaries; nor does any one Latin dictionary, except A. Sleumer's unobtainable *Kirchenlateinisches Wörterbuch* (1926²), contain all the later Latin words occurring in the language the priest uses in conversing with his Master.

J. C. PLUMPE.

CARMELITE AND POET: A FRAMED PORTRAIT OF SAINT JOHN OF THE CROSS. By Robert Sencourt. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1944. Pp. xiv + 278. $3.00.

"I realized that he was a saint and had always been a saint," writes St. Teresa in describing her first contact with St. John of the Cross. The judgement of this wise woman, herself a saint and mystic of renown, was borne out by his subsequent life, work, and writings. Despite this praise, St. John is a mystic and hence is faced by the modern equation of the mystical with the unreal, the impractical, the esoteric. It is to dissipate this psychological block that Mr. Sencourt has coined the metal mined by Père Bruno in his *Life of St. John of the Cross* and by Fray Crisogono, E. Allison Peers, E. I. Watkin, and Dom Bede Frost in their interpretations of the Carmelite saint's work and writings.

The author's method of making real St. John's place in Catholic life and making known his mystical doctrine is, in a sense, the thesis of this book. While recognizing the timeless and universal character of the mystical teaching of his subject, Mr. Sencourt endeavours to give his doctrine its proper setting in the character of this Doctor of the Church, his work, and his times. A fairly full study of St. John's mystical work is presented, and its object, unity, and coherence are made clear. The use and place of asceticism and renunciation are analyzed with a view to correcting erroneous opinions on the point. In keeping with the title of his book, the writer demonstrates from the saint's poetry that true mysticism and its accompanying self-discipline and control do not lessen but enlarge the love of created beauty. All this analysis of the mysticism of St. John is made warm and vital by Mr. Sencourt's depiction of how thoroughly his mystical doctrine is imbued by the personal attainments of the Spanish Carmelite. He is here drawn for us as a poet of the highest order, a philosopher, an accurate scholastic theologian, a penetrating spiritual psychologist, and an understanding director of souls. This portrait is further enriched by the author's inclusion of the Spanish historical framework in which St. John lived and wrote.

Though an attractive portrait, the book is patient of some criticism. The variety and number of elements worked into the pattern tend at times to throw the whole out of proportion, because they have not always been properly tailored to suit their purpose of merely furnishing background. Then, too, in his examination of the saint's mystical doctrine, the author's analysis would have been greatly clarified by a good technical discussion of contemplation and "the prayer of quiet" along the lines laid down by Father Maréchal in his *Studies in the Psychology of the Mystics*. Finally there is an occasional impression that the author has over-written some of his thoughts, particularly in the matter of poetic allusions and excerpts.

In spite of these relatively minor criticisms, this is a book which brings "both the personality and the science of the saint out of a rarified and inaccesible atmosphere" and exhibits him "as a real person speaking intelligibly about real things." As such it will serve as an absorbing glimpse of the mystical science and a royal road to the appreciation of one whom Professor Peers has placed on a level with St. Augustine, the "Prince of Mystics."

EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P.

PHYSICS AND PHILOSOPHY. By Sir James Jeans. Cambridge University Press; New York, The Macmillan Company, 1943. Pp. vii + 217. $2.75.

In recent years, two prominent physicists have tried to popularize the newly gained knowledge about the physical world, Eddington and Jeans. Their widely read books were written from the standpoint of philosophic idealism.

In the last few years, Eddington has written a series of technical papers in which he claims that the fundamental laws of physics are *a priori* laws. A considerable part of the present volume is devoted to the refutation of the claims of the "a priorists," among them Kant and Eddington. Jeans—in unconscious agreement with Scholasticism—defends the thesis that such laws must come from experience, and that Kant, for example, mistook purely physical (i.e., experimental) laws for laws of thought. Jeans proceeds so: We know now that, while the same general laws govern the whole physical world, three different features of these general laws are preponderant when we deal with differently sized phenomena, namely, those in the world of the stars, those in the medium sized world of every day life, those in the atomic world. If the fundamental laws of physics were *a priori*, Kant and similar thinkers would have had to find, by pure thought, the features decisive in the stellar and the atomic world also. However at that time only Newtonian physics, dealing with the medium sized world, was known, and only these limited, specialized laws the "a priorists" considered as *a priori*. The historical growth of our experimental knowledge has shown their limitations, and so proves that what was claimed to be *a priori* was only the partial knowledge which through experience had been acquired until that time.

While the discussions on the preceding subject are very useful and instructive, other parts of the book are almost puerile. Jeans' knowledge of the history of philosophy is very spotty, in particular he knows nothing about the philosophy of the middle ages or Catholic (and for that matter, Anglican) theology. He ascribes to Hobbes the principle "nihil est in intellectu quod non fuerit in sensibus," and designates Poincaré as the author of the remark that an accumulation of facts is not yet a science. He states that medieval philosophy was occupied with the subtilities and casuistries of theological doctrine in contradiction to Greek philosophy which used reason. He puts Descartes into the middle ages. Of the theologians (of the 16th century?) he says that they believed in determinism—because God has foreordained all things—but that this belief did not affect the pastoral theology they practiced.

He discusses at length the antithesis: freedom of the will—determinism. Now there is a problem there for the physicist in the interaction between mind and body. But that is not the main subject of Jeans' discussion. He is concerned with the partly metaphysical, partly psychological one of the motivation of human acts. Again the discussion seems to be highly superficial.

The physical problem expressed by the dualism: particle picture-wave picture is discussed in an interesting manner, although most theoretical physicists would, I believe, not agree completely. Jeans considers, if I understand him correctly, three levels, that of the particle picture, which depicts the phenomenal world, that of the wave picture giving the time pattern of events, and an unknown reality as background.

Most theoretical physicists believe, with Heisenberg, that both particle and wave *pictures* are partial analogies if we mean with "particle" or "wave" the everyday objects associated with these words; further that the reality as expressed in the equations can be described in the languages of one or the other of these pictures, provided we do not stick to the picture too closely.

KARL F. HERZFELD.

HUMANITY: WHAT? WHENCE? WHITHER? By the Rev. W. E. Orchard, D.D. Milwaukee, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1944. Pp. ix + 184. $2.00.

Basically, this is a work of apologetics, utilizing the internal and universal motives of credibility. Father Orchard shows that there is definite disagreement about the nature, the origin, and destiny of man. He points out the primitive explanation, which finds its historical manifestation in scholasticism, and contrasts this teaching with the "modern explanation" which, relying on the hypothesis of merely materialistic evolution, holds that mankind will never overcome its ills until it realizes that it has no supraterrestrial destiny. Some of the more obvious flaws of this teaching are indicated.

Admitting the need of a new synthesis, in effect a restatement of the scholastic position, Father Orchard teaches that philosophy alone can never offer a fully satisfactory account of man, as he actually exists. He shows how a recourse to revelation is in itself reasonable, and then indicates, gently but with sufficient firmness, the advantages of that revealed message which is proposed within the Catholic Church.

The author pleads for a movement towards religious unity within the Catholic Church. He calls attention to the apparent ease with which false leaders influence great masses of the people and he contends that an equal amount of effort by men interested in truth should bring men together. He recognizes an essential, but tremendously difficult condition for the achievement of this effect. "We must somehow cease to quarrel among ourselves" (p. 163).

According to Father Orchard "this book is not appealing so much to Christians, of whatever persuasion, as to those who not only have no ecclesiastical attachments, but indeed may have hitherto preferred the nonreligious interpretation of existence and a materialistic interpretation of reality" (p. 166). The entire work gives evidence of this orientation. It is not a book which will give Catholics an adequate notion of those motives of credibility which certify their faith as prudent and reasonable. It would seem, however, to be valuable for the type of persons to whom it is addressed, persons who might be in some spiritual danger from "Sunday Supplement" presentations of science.

A footnote on page 121 speaks of *The Nature and the Attribution of God* by Garrigou-Lagrange. Father Messenger's name is misspelled in another footnote, on page 138.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON.

A KEY TO HAPPINESS. The Art of Suffering. By Marguerite Duportal. Translated from the French by Romuald Pecasse, S. O. Cist. Milwaukee, Bruce Publishing Company, 1944. Pp. xviii + 124. $1.75.

A volume with the alluring title *The Key to Happiness* should appeal to every seeker for the satisfaction of the primary desire of the human heart. It is somewhat chastening, however, to discover that the title of the original French book, of which this work is a translation, was *De la Souffrance.* Hence, we learn that real happiness consists in the acceptance, in patience and resignation, of the suffering which is an inevitable condition in the life of every man. Happiness is found in resignation to the will of God, be the circumstances foul or fair. This is, in a word, the thesis of the book. Its truth is beyond question. But an old truth does not lose force by being restated and the restatement in *A Key to Happiness*, of Duportal and Pecasse, is one quite worthy of inclusion in any collection of books of spiritual reading.

The author divides the treatment of the art of suffering into three logical sections: suffering in relation to God, suffering in the presence of others (which we think should have been labelled, "suffering with relation to others,") and suffering with regard to oneself. The best discussion is that concerning suffering as a part of the divine plan, especially the futility of rebelling against it or making it the subject of criticism. The old question of reconciling the existence of suffering with the divine goodness is dealt with rather summarily but not without conviction as the classic objections are urged and answered in the conventional style.

The English version is, in the main, idiomatic; but traces of foreign origin are occasionally evident in Gallicisms such as those sighing expressions which are characteristic of many ascetical works of a century or a century and a half ago, which leaned heavily on their French originals. The examples which are employed to illustrate the ideas of the author would be more forceful were they more up-to-date and less equally applicable to medieval and modern times.

These qualities impair only slightly the merit of the book, which can be recommended as decidedly helpful, especially to those whose understanding of the spiritual life is elementary, and whose idea is too apt to be that happiness must consist in unalloyed satisfaction of our own will. The author lays the stress where it belongs, for the most fundamental principle of Christian living is also the highest axiom of Christian perfection, namely, the application of the clause of the most familiar of our prayers, "Thy will be done."

WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

SUBDEACONSHIP. Conferences on The Rite of Ordination. By Rev. Aloysius Biskupek, S.V.D. St. Louis and London, B. Herder Book Co., 1944. Pp. xii + 301. $2.50.

DEACONSHIP. Conferences on The Rite of Ordination. By Rev. Aloysius Biskupek, S.V.D. St. Louis and London, B. Herder Book Co., 1944. Pp. v + 258. $2.50.

Anyone familiar with Father Biskupek's *Our Sacrifice* will not be disappointed in his latest works. They reflect the serious thought and meditation of one very familiar with the Roman Pontifical. The reader finds in these two volumes a very full treatment of the prayers during the ordination ceremony. The author takes each succeeding step with its distinct ideas and develops them at moderate length with plenty of thoughts for meditation. His reflections are realistic and practical for the *ordinandus* as well as for the *ordinatus*, thus making them valuable books in the library of every seminarian and every priest. The priesthood, every seminarian's goal and objective, is never lost sight of as one studies these pages, and it is this factor that should recommend them to our future priests. A young man preparing for ordination will regret not being acquainted with these volumes, among the best published to date on the Pontifical.

Father Biskupek's style is attractive and sufficiently varied, which is not easy for a work of this nature. An outstanding feature is his multiple use of the Scriptures, particularly St. Paul and St. John. Likewise, for his many and various illustrations, he refers frequently to the lives of the saints.

It is to be regretted, however, that, at the beginning of each volume, the complete ceremony or prayers of the Pontifical for subdeaconship and deaconship have not been inserted. Such an addition would have proved helpful as a happy memory to the one already ordained; and to the one preparing for ordination the entire ceremony would be presented as a unit. Wartime paper restrictions may have occasioned this omission. The books are well printed and attractively made up.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.